

54686

54686 / 168

ACTA UNIVERSITATIS DE ATTILA JÓZSEF NOMINATAE

ACTA ANTIQUA et ARCHAEOLOGICA

Tomus XIII.

1971 SEP 22



SZEGED
HUNGARIA
1970

Redigit

S. SZÁDECZKY-KARDOSS

ACTA UNIVERSITATIS DE ATTILA JÓZSEF NOMINATAE
ACTA ANTIQUA ET ARCHAEOLOGICA
Tomus XIII.

KISEBB DOLGOZATOK
a klasszika-filológia és a régészet köréből

MINORA OPERA
ad philologiam classicam et archaeologiam pertinentia
XIII.

J. HARMATTA

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY AND LANGUAGE OF THE SARMATIANS

Szeged 1970



CONTENTS

PREFACE	4
I. THE WESTERN SARMATIANS IN THE NORTH PONTIC REGION	
1. From the Cimmerii up to the Sarmatians	7
2. Strabo's Report on the Western Sarmatian Tribal Confederacy	12
3. Late Scythians and Sarmatians. The Amage Story	15
4. The Western Sarmatian Tribal Confederacy and the North Pontic Greek Cities.....	20
5. Mithridates VI and the Sarmatians	23
6. The Sarmatians on the Lower Danube	26
7. Chronology of the Rise and Fall of the Western Sarmatian Tribal Confederacy.....	29
8. The Sarmatians and the Yüeh-chih Migration	31
9. The Sarmatian Phalerae and Their Eastern Relations	34
10. Conclusions	39
II. THE SARMATIANS IN HUNGARY	
1. The Immigration into Hungary of the Iazyges	41
2. The Iazyges and the Roxolani	45
3. Goths and Roxolani	48
4. The Disappearance of the Roxolani	49
5. The Immigration into Hungary of the Roxolani	51
6. The Evacuation of Dacia and the Roxolani	53
7. The Fall of the Sarmatians in Hungary	55
III. THE LANGUAGE OF THE SARMATIANS	
1. A History of the Problem	58
2. Proto-Iranian and Ossetian	69
3. The Sarmatian Dialects of the North Pontic Region.....	76
4. Conclusions	95
APPENDIX I. ADDITIONAL NOTES	98
APPENDIX II. SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	108
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	111
INDEX	113

PREFACE

Since the publication of my "Studies on the History of the Sarmatians" (Budapest 1950. Pp. 63) and my "Studies in the Language of the Iranian Tribes in South Russia" (Budapest 1952. Pp. 59) two decades elapsed. At that time both works were printed in a very limited number of copies and they went shortly out of print. My results and hypotheses regarding the history and languages of the Sarmatians aroused keen interest in historical, archaeological and linguistic researches. The following reviews of the two publications became available to me: 1. on "Studies on the History of the Sarmatians" E. Meyer: *Museum Helveticum* 8 (1951) 361, V. Pisani: *Paideia* 6 (1951) 438, A. Aymard: *Revue des Etudes Grecques* 64 (1951) 501, E. H. Minns: *JHS* 42 (1952) 142—143, J. Gy. Szilágyi: *Acta Arch. Hung.* 2 (1952) 357—359, M. Párducz: *Acta Arch. Hung.* 2 (1952) 357—359, T. Horváth: *A. E.* 80 (1953) 72—73, E. Swoboda: *Anz. f. A.* 8 (1955) 35—37. 2. on "Studies in the Language of the Iranian Tribes in South Russia" V. I. Abaev: *Izv. AN SSSR OLY* 1953, vol. XII/5 487—490, I. Gershevitch: *JHS* 45 (1955), 191—192 H. v. Mžik: *ZDMG* 104 (1954) 208, V. Pisani: *Paideia* 8 (1953) 405. I express my best thanks to my critics for all their valuable remarks.

Besides, both works exerted a considerable influence on historical, archaeological and linguistic researches dealing with the Sarmatians. My results and suggestions were often quoted, adopted, developed, modified, criticized and discussed both at home and abroad. It is easy to understand that during the last decades both publications were often wanted by scholars studying the Iranian tribes of Eastern Europe but no demand could have been satisfied. Therefore, I willingly accepted the proposal by Professor S. Szádeczky-Kardoss to republish both monographs in the *Acta Antiqua et Archaeologica* edited by him.

Examining the vast literature published during the last two decades on the subject, I would most willingly write a new book, a detailed history of the Sarmatians. The great amount of valuable results achieved mainly by Soviet archaeologists would make now possible to elaborate the problems, discussed in my books, in a more detailed manner as before. Taking into consideration, however, that both works became solid constituents of scholarly research since two decades and considering that most researchers look for the references to them occurring in scientific literature, I abandoned the plan of a radical rewriting and restricting myself to minor corrections I left the text essentially unchanged. In any case I added some additional notes and a

selected bibliography with the aim of informing about my present views and the recent results of historical, archaeological and linguistic researches.

Surely a detailed analysis of Sarmatian history and language remains an important desideratum in the future too. On the basis of prolonged researches I propose to do it, if the circumstances permit me to realize my project. For the time being I only refer to my recent papers dealing with this subject (cf. the selected bibliography). I express my best thanks to all scholars who gave me valuable support by sending their books and papers, discussing different problems in personal talks and informing me about recent finds and results during the last decades. Finally, I would warmly thank Professor S. Szádeczky-Kardoss who kindly made the new edition of my two works on the Sarmatians in the *Acta Antiqua et Archaeologica* possible.

I. THE WESTERN SARMATIANS IN THE NORTH PONTIC REGION

1. From the Cimmerii up to the Sarmatians

The significance of the nomadic Iranian peoples, the Cimmerii, Scythians and Sarmatians, emerges with ever-increasing clarity from the point of view of the evolution of Slav culture and ethnic characteristics. Thus the more recent Soviet historical science, as compared with the older trend which began the history of Russia only with the Varangians, in dealing with the antecedents of the formation of the first Russian state, goes back, at least as far as the Scythian epoch. Accordingly B. D. Grekov emphasizes the importance of Scytho-Sarmatian culture from the aspect of the Eastern Slavs¹ and P. I. Lyashchenko too deals in detail with these two peoples in his economic history of the USSR.² An even more far-reaching significance is ascribed to the Sarmatians in connection with the Southern Slavs by G. Vernadsky, according to whose theory Slav and Sarmatian tribes had been living together as early as pre-Christian times in Southern Russia. This gave rise to the later Russians with regard to ethnic character and culture. In his opinion even the name "rus" derives from the name of a Sarmatian tribe.³ To some extent also the conception of V. V. Mavrodin tallies with this view.⁴ Despite the recognition of the historical significance of the Sarmatians, their history nevertheless is obscure on many a point, in fact no unified picture could be formed of it. In the following we wish to throw light on one period of Sarmatian history which has hitherto not been elucidated.

The appearance of the Huns has been generally held responsible to have set in motion the large-scale movement of peoples that has been known by history as the Migration of Peoples. The appearance of the Huns in Europe was without doubt of decisive importance in history, yet it would be a mistake to believe that their entry to Eastern and Central Europe had been an entirely new and isolated phenomenon in the history of those parts of Europe. Over a century ago A. Hansen already saw clearly that the Migration of Peoples had begun a thousand years earlier with the appearance of the Scythians,⁵ and recent investigations have convincingly demonstrated that the migration of the Huns was only one episode in the long series of migrations in the course of which the equestrian nomads of the steppes moved from east to west, and that the movement spread for over more than two thousand years. The process

¹ B. D. Grekov, *The Culture of Kiev Rus*. Moscow, 1947. pp. 18.

² P. I. Lyashchenko, *Istoriya narodnogo khozyaistva SSSR. Vol. I* (1947), 38—40.

³ G. Vernadsky, *Ancient Russia*. New Haven, 1943. pp. 74, *passim*. See my remarks on the matter RHC. N. S. V (1947), pp. 230.

⁴ V. V. Mavrodin, *Obrazovanie drevnerusskogo gosudarstva*. Leningrad, 1945. 390.

⁵ A. Hansen, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Völkerwanderung. I. Ost-Europa nach Herodot*. Dorpat, 1844.

set in with the appearance of the Cimmerii at a thousand years B. C. The earliest known seat of the Cimmerii was in the Caucasus and on the adjoining steppes lying north to it; subsequently they penetrated further west and entered South Hungary in the course of the 8th century B. C. The archaeological remains relating to these peoples, contain a great number of horse trappings; one find of a reflex-bow, identified recently, clearly points to a warrior people with equestrian bowmen. The Cimmerii were, therefore, the first people who introduced to Europe a nomad type of warfare that employed equestrian bowmen in large numbers. The migration of the Cimmerii swept along with them a number of peoples who belonged to other ethnic groups, but there can be no doubt about it that the ruling classes of the Cimmerii must have spoken an Iranian language judging from the names of their rulers. It is, therefore, highly probable that they had originally come from somewhere in the steppes of Kazakhstan which was supposedly the cradle of the Iranian peoples.⁶

A new equestrian nomad people appeared soon in the footsteps of the Cimmerii: the Scythians, who in the course of their westward movement put an end to the power of the Cimmerii. At the end of the 6th century B. C. the Scythians had already invaded and conquered the South Russian steppes and penetrated further into the western borderlands of the Eurasian steppe belt. Judging from the archaeological remains the remnants of the Cimmerii settled in two separate lots, namely in Transylvania and along the river Tisa. The number of Cimmerii settled in Hungary at that time must, however, have been so small that they soon became merged into the indigenous Daco-Mysian tribes and into the Celtic peoples who had come to Hungary from the west. Like the Cimmerii, the Scythians also spoke an Iranian language, and so their arrival, one incident in the migration of the equestrian nomad peoples, again increased the preponderance of Iranian elements on the East European steppes.⁷

In the course of the migrations taking place in the Eurasian steppe belt, a new Iranian people, the Sarmatians, followed the Scythians to South Russia in the last centuries B. C. According to the current view we can trace their origin and history as far back as the 5th century B. C.⁸ It was at this time that the contemporary account of Herodotus reported (IV. 21) that eastwards to the Scythians and beyond the river Tanais (=Don), there settled a people called the Sauromatae. The Sauromatae of Herodotus have generally been thought the same peoples as the Sarmatae

⁶ For the latest stand of the investigations concerning the Cimmerii see J. Harmatta, *AE* 7/8 (1946—48), pp. 107 ff.

⁷ The outstanding publications on the Scythians are: E. H. Minns, *Scythians and Greeks*. Cambridge, 1913.; M. Ebert, *Südrußland im Altertum*. Bonn—Leipzig, 1921.; M. Ebert in *RLV XIII*, pp. 52 ff.; M. Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*. Oxford, 1922.; M. Rostowzew, *Skythien und der Bosporus. I*. Berlin, 1931. On the Scythian archaeological remains found in Hungary see N. Fettich, *Bestand der skythischen Altertümer Ungarns*, in Rostowzew's *Skythien und der Bosporus, vol. I*, pp. 494 ff. Since the latter publication many new Scythian remains from the Tisza region have become known. For these see M. Párducz, *Dolgozatok (Studies)* 16 (1940), pp. 79 ff., *AE* 4 (1943), pp. 50 ff., *AE* 5/6 (1944—45), pp. 62 ff. For literature on the Scythians in Hungary see P. Reinecke in *AE* 17 (1897), pp. 9 ff.; V. Párvan, *Getica. O Protoistorie a Daciei*. Bucureşti, 1926., pp. 6 ff.; V. G. Childe, *The Danube in Prehistory*. Oxford, 1929., pp. 394 ff. Rostowzew, *Skythien und der Bosporus. Vol. I*, pp. 530 ff. J. Nestor, *Bericht der römisch-germanischen Komm.* 22 (1932), pp. 143 ff. N. Fettich, *La trouvaille scythe de Zöldhalompuszta* in *AH III*. Budapest, 1929, and the same author's *Der skythische Fund von Gartschinowo*. *AH XV*. Budapest, 1934. On the ancient tribes of South Russia see S. A. Žebelev in *VDI*, 1938 I. pp. 149 ff.

⁸ See among others Ebert, *Südrußland im Altertum*, pp. 339 ff. and his contribution in *RLV XIII*, p. 61. K. Kretschmer in *RE II*. R. I., pp. 2545 ff., M. Vasmer, *Die Iranier in Südrußland*. Leipzig, 1923., pp. 23 ff., and his contribution in *RLV XII*. p. 237.

of a later date.⁹ But Rostovtzeff, one of the foremost authorities on Scythian and Sarmatian archaeology, went so far as to deny that the two peoples had anything in common apart from a superficial similarity in their names. The description of the Sauromatae by Herodotus (IV. 110—117) shows obvious traces of a matriarchy or gynaecocracy, and Rostovtzeff adduces this as an argument to prove that this Iranian tribe had absorbed a great many local ethnic elements of the land. On the other hand, as Rostovtzeff points out, not the slightest traces of a social organization can be recovered that would point to a matriarchy with the Sarmatians.¹⁰ Rostovtzeff's arguments have been rejected by practically all the investigators,¹¹ and in his latest summary of the question he himself has undertaken a certain modification of his original attitude on the dissimilarity of the Sauromatae and the Sarmatae.¹²

It cannot be maintained that the position Rostovtzeff had originally taken, was the best way to get rid of the difficulties, though it must be also admitted that not much was gained either by identifying the two peoples or by looking upon the two tribal names as simply being doublets. It must on no account be forgotten that it has so far not been unequivocally established what the names Sauromatae and Sarmatae connote ethnically; such a delimitation has not even been attempted though, it stands to reason, that without attempting such a definition, the question can never be solved in a satisfactory way. As soon as we set about to remedy this deficiency, we shall find already at the outset that the problem is far more complicated than either Rostovtzeff or his antagonists have ever imagined. The name Sauromatae as employed by Herodotus (IV. 21, 110—17), seems to suggest that it was used as a designation of an Iranian tribe whose seats lay east of Scythia, and that an attempt was made by him to delimit their actual seats with some accuracy by means of cartographical terms. Hardly a century had passed after the time of Herodotus when Ephoros widened the term of Sauromatae,¹³ while his successors employed the name to denote a number of actual and mythical peoples.¹⁴

A century and a half will have to elapse after Ephoros before the name Sarmatae crops up for the first time in its historically accepted form, but even then the evidence contained in this first mention is so scanty that it is hardly sufficient to define what ethnic features went with the name Sarmatae.¹⁵ It was only considerably later that a picture was given of the ethnic background of the name Sarmatae by Strabo (VII, 5, 18) in an information that can be traced back to Artemidoros. Strabo called Sarmatae a number of tribes or peoples who in his time made their first entry into classical literature. He used the term in a rather general sense and employed it to call by that name a number of tribes that were newcomers on the stage of history. The name received an even wider range of application later in the first centuries A. D. when it came to

⁹ In addition to the literature quoted in the previous footnote see on this question the works of J. Marquart, *Erānsāhr*. Berlin, 1901. p. 155. E. Herzfeld in AMI I (1929—30), p. 102, footnote I. H. H. Schaeder, *Iranica*. Berlin, 1934., p. 50.

¹⁰ See Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, pp. 32 ff., his *Skythien und der Bosphorus*, vol. I., p. 101, and his book on *The Animal Style in South Russia and China*. Princeton (1929), pp. 44 f.

¹¹ On the position taken by other scholars see among others Altheim—Szabó in WaG 2 (1936), p. 318, footnote 24, and J. Junge, *Saka-Studien*. Leipzig, 1939. 9, footnote 2, pp. 73 f.

¹² Cf. CAH XI., pp. 91 f.

¹³ See J. Harmatta, *Quellenstudien zu den Skythika des Herodot*. Budapest, 1941, pp. 18 f.

¹⁴ An attempt of this nature can be seen among others with Mela (I 116) who included among the Sauromatae peoples like the Budini, Thyssagetæ and Iyrcae. See J. Harmatta, *Quellenstudien zu den Skythika des Herodot*, pp. 8 f., pp. 11 f. and p. 19.

¹⁵ The Sarmatae were first mentioned without any doubt by Polybios who included Gatalos, king of the Sarmatae, as one of the parties to a treaty concluded in 179 B. C. The passage can be found in Polybios XXV 2.

be applied to peoples who formerly used to be well-known in geographical literature but who had since then been entirely lost sight of.¹⁶

This brief survey in itself will suffice to convince that the ethnic entities associated with the names Sauromatae and Sarmatae, may not be identified without reservations, not even if proofs were forthcoming that both names happened to be identical.¹⁷ Such an erroneous identification would lead to a number of difficulties. How are we going to account for it in a satisfactory way why the name Sauromatae, that had already acquired a rather general application in the 4th century B. C., should come to be used in a narrower sense by Strabo in the form Sarmatae to denote a number of Iranian tribes that had but shortly been brought to the notice of the contemporaries? This latter fact undoubtedly suggests that a new wave of migration had by then broken over the steppes of South Russia. Such a belief receives confirmation from archaeological evidence, too. It was no other than Rostovtzeff himself who examined a portion of South Russian archaeological material from the last two centuries B. C., and in reference to the gilded silver phalerae, that characterised one group of finds, he came to the conclusion that the style of these phalerae stood in a rather close relation to Graeco-Indian art.¹⁸ In view of the great number of relevant finds, this relationship, according to Rostovtzeff, can only be accounted for by assuming that the phalerae must have been used by tribes that had formerly been settled in the east in a close vicinity to Indo-Scythian tribes from whom the style of workmanship had been adopted and brought to South Russia.

Premissa like the foregoing make it rather likely that in the last centuries B. C., there had appeared a number of new Iranian tribes coming from the east. This again involves that, speaking ethnically, the names Sauromatae and Sarmatae must on no condition be identified, not even if it is assumed that the two names happened to be identical; on the other hand we may surmise that the ethnic entities of the Sauromatae—Sarmatae had undergone a change in the intervening period.

A careful scrutiny of the results obtained concerning the identification of the Sauromatae and Sarmatae peoples, suggest the conclusion that the original seats of the Sarmatae have to be put considerably further east but on no account with the Sauromatae of Herodotus. The name Sarmatae could not have been the name of one single tribe only, it must have been much more a collective name for a number of tribes scattered over a wide area. This again implies that the ethnic background of the name Sarmatae included features widely divergent in time as well as in geographical distribution.

Among the epigraphical sources of the ancient history of South Russia the so-called Protogenes inscription has been given an outstanding significance.¹⁹ The inscription was found on a memorial tablet dating from the beginning of the 2nd century B. C.,²⁰ and was dedicated in honour of Protogenes, her much esteemed citizen, by the Greek town Olbia in grateful acknowledgement for the help received

¹⁶ Cf. Pliny the Elder's *Natural History* VI 19. See also J. Harmatta, *Quellenstudien zu den Skythika des Herodot*, p. 11.

¹⁷ From a linguistic point of view the names were identified by Marquart, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran*. II. Leipzig, 1905, p. 78 and in his *Eränshahr*. p. 155. See also Vasmer, *Die Iranier in Südrussland*, p. 51. E. Herzfeld in *AMl* 1 (1929—30), p. 102, footnote 1. Schaefer, *Iranica*, p. 50. Contrary to them N. S. Nyberg, *Die Religionen des alten Iran*. Leipzig, 1938, p. 250 considered the two names to derive from different roots.

¹⁸ Rostovtsev, *Sarmatskiya i indoskifskiya drevnosti*. Recueil-Kondakov. Prague, 1926, pp. 239 ff. See also N. Fettich, *Die Metallkunst der landnehmenden Ungarn*. AH XXXI. Budapest, 1937. pp. 142 ff.

¹⁹ Cf. Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. No 495.

²⁰ See a recent article by Altheim—Szabó in *WaG* 2 (1936), p. 319.

in many of the crises that had confronted the community. The inscription gives us a close-up of the hard times that had come upon the once prosperous town. The flourishing and peaceful life of the town to which Herodotus bore testimony, had been a thing of the past by then. Numbers and numbers of new peoples threatened to sack and destroy the town (cf. lines 102 ff. of the Protogenes inscription). The inscription gives a list of these new peoples by name such as the Saii, Galatae, Skiri, Thisamatae and Saudaratae. From among these only the Galatae and the Skiri are known to us from other sources. The Galatae were a Celtic tribe of South Russia whose presence can be proved by archaeological evidence.²¹ The Skiri²² were a Teutonic tribe who were to play some part in the age of the Huns. The other tribal names mentioned on the inscription such as the Saii, the Thisamatae, the Saudaratae, have never been mentioned in any other sources.

There are, however, clues that contribute to our knowledge of these otherwise unknown peoples. The inscription includes the name Saitapharnes, king of the Saii, and his name can be established without doubt to have been an Iranian proper name.²³ This is a useful hint to establish the origin of the tribal name Saii,²⁴ which can be sufficiently explained as an Iranian derivative and its meaning is multi-coloured.²⁵ The adjective was often used as a proper name with a number of nomad tribes, and especially with the horsebreeding nomads it used to refer to the colour of the tribe's horses.²⁶ Thus among others we know a number of Turk tribes with the tribal name Bulaq (= multi-coloured).²⁷ This is significant in so far as it may serve in a way as a hint to trace the origins of the Saii. A multi-coloured type of horse was known in Chinese records,²⁸ and may, therefore, be taken as a typical Asiatic equine variety.²⁹ Undomesticated specimens of this breed were still seen by Przewalsky in Asia.³⁰ If,

²¹ See Rostowzew, *Skythien und der Bosphorus*, vol. I. p. 465 ff.

²² L. Schmidt deals with them in his *Die Ostgermanen*. München, 1941, pp. 47 f.

²³ See Vasmer's *Die Iranier in Südrussland*. p. 50. It was justly pointed out by Tomaschek that the first element of the compound name may be compared with Avestan *šāeta-* (= Geld, Vermögen) and the second element to Avestan *xvārənah-*, Old Persian *farnah-* (= Ruhm, Ruhmesglanz, Herrlichkeit, Hoheit, Majestät). The name *Saitapharnes* may, therefore, be related to an Iranian **šaita-farn*. This is an instance of the bahuvrīhi type of word-composition, and it may be rendered by "der durch Vermögen Herrlichkeit besitzt".

²⁴ Tomaschek in his *Die alten Thraker*, I. p. 99., connected the word Saii with Avestan *xšaya-* which means "Herrscher, Fürst, König". Vasmer in *Die Iranier in Südrussland*, p. 50., doubts the possibility of such a comparison since the Greek transcription of the name points to an initial *s-* or *š-*. Against this we have to point out that in some of the New Iranian languages a sound-change from *xš-* to *š-* is an established fact. Thus e. g. the outcome of Old Iranian *xšaya-* sounds in Wakhi and Šuyni as follows: Wakhi *šāi* "fat, rich", Shughni *šayēn* "khans". Although the modern forms of Old Iranian **xšaya-* entirely coincide, as far as phonetic development goes, with the tribal name Saii, yet this coincidence may be a fortuitous one since the Iranian dialects in South Russia have not so far yielded any evidence that would justify to assume a phonetic change from *xš-* to *š-*.

N. Jokl in RLV XIII, p. 281, pointed out the phonological identity between the word Saii and the Thracian tribal name Saii. Dittenberger, however, has proved that this contention is far from being likely. See the latter's *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. I. p. 739, footnote 12.

²⁵ Compare Avestan *sāy-* (= ungleichmäßig gefärbt, scheckig), *sāyuzdri-* "Eigenname eines Gläubigen". Specific meaning of latter: "des weibliche Zugtiere scheckig sind" Bartholomae, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. 1569, 1572.

²⁶ See J. Németh in KCsA 1. Ergänzungsband (1938) pp. 345 ff. J. Harmatta in MNy 42 (1938), pp. 27 ff.

²⁷ See J. Harmatta in MNy 42 (1946), p. 31.

²⁸ Cf. E. Chavannes, *Documents sur les T'ou-Kiue (Tures) occidentaux*. St. Petersburg. 1903, p. 29.

²⁹ For further information on this point see J. Németh in KCsA 1 Erg. Bd. (1938). pp. 349 ff.

³⁰ See Bretschneider, *Mediaeval Researches*. I. 168., p. 463 footnote.

therefore, the Saii had a peculiar breed of horses, and this may be assumed, then they themselves together with their horses, must have come into South Russia from the West-Asiatic steppes.

This evidence is of great importance since in the Saii we believe to have got hold of the first eastern tribe that had been pushed along by the new Iranian wave of migration. And this new Iranian wave seems to be significant. The name Saii covers, namely, not only one single tribe but rather a federation of tribes since the Protogenes inscription mentions their tribal chiefs in the plural number (cf. lines 43 f.). Further the name Saios³¹ on one Panticapaeum inscription may be taken to witness to their subsequent spread eastwards and attest the fact of their survival.

The other tribal names on the Protogenes inscription: Thisamatae and Saudaratae, are not unlikely of Iranian origin,³² that is to say, like the Saii tribe, we may also take these two peoples to have been Iranians. And since the inscription made separate mention of the Scythians, it is not unreasonable to assume that the two tribes did not belong to the Scythians; as we have done, with the Saii, we may take them also to have belonged to the new, eastern tribes of Iranian descent. It is of decisive importance, therefore, that the Protogenes inscription did not call any of these newcomers by the name of Sarmatae; nor can it be said that the name Sarmatae was not known in those days for Polybios mentioned it in the peace treaty of 179 as referred to above. There is one explanation open to account for this strange circumstance, and that is that the name Sarmatae was not a tribal proper name but only an appellation of a more general application, the use of which was spread by literary means. This, of course, makes it peremptory to search for the solution of the difficulties attached thereto, more on literary basis than by any other means.

2. Strabo's Report on the Western Sarmatian Tribal Confederacy

Strabo in his description of the western part of the Pontic region mentions the Sarmatians several times, speaking of them in general terms. However, in the most essential passage he mentions particular tribes: VII 3, 17: ἡ δὲ ὑπερκειμένη πᾶσα χώρα τοῦ λεχθέντος μεταξύ Βορυσθένους καὶ Ἰστροῦ πρώτη μὲν ἐστὶν ἡ τῶν Γετῶν ἐρημία, ἔπειτα οἱ Τυραγῆται, μεθ' οὓς οἱ Ἰάζυγες Σαρμάται καὶ οἱ Βασίλαιοι λεγόμενοι καὶ Οὐργοὶ, τὸ μὲν πλεον νομάδες, ὀλίγοι δὲ καὶ γεωργίας ἐπιμελοῦμενοι τούτους φασὶ καὶ παρὰ τὸν Ἰστρον οἰκεῖν, ἐφ' ἑκάτερα πολλάκις. ἐν δὲ τῇ μεσογαίᾳ Βαστάρναι μὲν ... Ῥωξολανοὶ δ' ἀρκτικώτατοι τὰ μεταξύ τοῦ Τανάϊδος καὶ τοῦ Βορυσθένους νεμόμενοι πεδιά. Strabo thus enumerates four Sarmatian tribes: the Iazyges, Royal Sarmatians, Urgi and Roxolani and according to his description, their location on the whole might be conjectured thus: the Iazyges, the Urgi and Royal Sarmatians between the Dnieper and the Danube, furthermore, according to Strabo's description, the southernmost part was occupied by the Iazyges, and the Urgi took up the northern position while the Royal Sarmatians were in the center between the two former tribes. The fourth tribe, the Roxolani, lived east of these between the Dnieper and the Don. Thus a certain plan in the sites of these tribes is to be observed: in the center is the royal tribe surrounded as it were by a protective ring formed by the other tribes.

It is certainly no coincidence that among these Sarmatians, one "royal" tribe can be found. In the tribal confederacies of nomadic peoples two main types may be distinguished: in the first, tribes live side by side, loosely connected and at the

³¹ See Vasmer, *Die Iranier in Südrussland*, p. 50.

³² See Vasmer, *Die Iranier in Südrussland*, p. 51.

most cooperate more closely in times of danger. In the other case all tribes are under the leadership of one of the tribes and are closely and cooperatively united under its power. A strong central power and strict military organization often give to these nomadic tribal confederacies an impressive power which renders possible the establishment of empires of vast extent. The varied character of nomadic tribal confederacies had been observed already by the Byzantines, e. g. Leo the Wise makes a clear distinction between "the idle nomadic" Scythians, i. e. nomad peoples "living under many chiefs" and the Scythians "under strong leadership" (XVIII 42; *πολύαρχά τε καὶ ἀπράγμονα, νομαδικῶς ὡς ἐπίπαν βιοῦντα ~ μοναρχούμενα*). The tribe heading the tribal confederacy in accordance with its position considers itself high above the others. So it follows, according to the description of Herodotus, that the Persians hold themselves to be by far the most eminent of men, and the farther the other peoples live from them, the meaner grade they occupy in Persian estimation (I 134). It is again Herodotus who reports (IV 20) that the leading Scythian tribe also regards the other Scythians as its slaves. In accordance with this domineering spirit based on a strongly stratified society, this leading tribe is called "Royal Scythians" (see Herodotus IV 22, 56, 59).

That this connotation is not solely a Greek invention is probable also on the strength of the above mentioned data; it seems, however, that there is direct evidence in one of Strabo's reports of such nomenclatures being rooted in the social attitude and linguistic usage of Iranian nomads. Strabo, when dealing with the origin of Arsaces and of the Parni, gives the name of the Dahian tribe living beyond the Maeotis: *φασὶ δὲ τοὺς Πάρκωνος Δάας μετανάστας εἶναι ἐκ τῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς Μαιώτιδος Λαῶν, οὓς Ξανδίους ἢ Παρίους καλοῦσιν* (IX 9, 3). According to Vasmer's view the tribal name *Ξάνδιοι* was based on the fact of the "Royal" Scythians having lived on the same place prior to these. It originated from the Iranian word *xšāyant-* "dominating" and refers to the linguistic matter of the Sarmatians.³³ Vasmer, however, overlooked that this report of Strabo is taken from a source which in keeping with the geographical conception resulting from Alexander the Great's campaigns, had imagined the Syr-Darya to be identical with the Tanais-Don and imagined Lake Aral and the Caspian Sea to be linked and both to be identical with the Maeotis—Sea of Azov. Thus the Dahae, or their *Ξάνδιοι* tribes have nothing in common with the "Royal Scythians" or the later Sarmatians and cannot be located near the Sea of Azov, but they might have occupied the steppes north of Lake Aral. This stands out clearly from another passage of Strabo (XI 8, 2) where along with the *Ἀπαρνοὶ* and the *Πίσσουροι* he enumerates also the *Ξάνθιοι* as a tribe of the Dahae living on the Aralo-Caspian steppes. There can hardly exist any doubt as to the identity of the tribal names of *Ξάνθιοι* and the *Ξάνδιοι*, and so we may see in the bearers of this name in all probability an Eastern Iranian tribe.

Even though the connection with the "Royal Scythians" must be abandoned despite the argument that the tribal name of *Ξάνδιοι* derives from the Iranian word *xšāyant-*, it nevertheless seems a plausible explanation both from the point of view of phonetics and semantics. It is true that the Old Iranian sound group *-aya-* has a much more common development in *-ay-* or *ē*, etc. than in *-ā-*. Notwithstanding, there are several examples of this too,³⁴ so that it might also be applied to the name of *Ξάνδιοι*. From the point of view of semantics this explanation is born out by Strabo

³³ M. Vasmer, *Untersuchungen über die ältesten Wohnsitze der Slaven, I: Die Iranier in Südrußland*, Leipzig, 1923. p. 45.

³⁴ See H. Hübschmann, *Persische Studien*, Strassburg, 1895. p. 167; G. Morgenstierne, *Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages. II*. Oslo, 1938. p. 61.

who calls this Dahian tribe also Πάριοι, and though it is not absolutely certain that the meaning of the latter name tallies with the former, in any case it is close to it. The name of Πάριοι is probably identical with Old-Iranian *parvya- = "first" (cf. Old Persian *paraviya-*, Avestan *paouruya-*, *paoirya-* "der erste, primus" Bartholome, *AirWb.* 874)³⁵. Thus belonging to the same semantic sphere as the tribal name of Ξάνδιοι it denotes the "ruling, leading, first", that is to say "royal" tribe. From the viewpoint of meaning the name of the ruling clan of the Royal Scythians offers an exact parallel. Herodotus (IV 6) reports this in the form of Παραλάται and since Müllenhoff it has been customary to regard it as the Scythian word corresponding to the Avestan *paradāta-* "Ehrentitel des Fürsten *Haosrānha*" signifying probably "voran, an die Spitze gestellt" (see Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 854)³⁶. It is possible that the name of Πάριοι after all, like the Scythian Παραλάται, is no more than the name of the ruling dynasty of the Δάαι Ξάνδιοι, that is of the "Royal Dahae".

From the point of view of the Western Sarmatians, it is of the utmost importance that the appearance of "royal tribes" in the Iranian nomadic tribal confederacies went hand in hand with the formation of strong central power. It is, therefore, easy to approach the assumption that the Sarmatian tribes between the Danube and the Don described by Strabo do not suggest "idle" nomads living either loosely linked, or independently from each other, side by side, but much rather a tribal confederacy under a strong central leadership which, in the times referred to by Strabo, held a considerable part of the Pontic region in their sway. With regard to Eastern European history it is perhaps unnecessary to stress the importance of the existence of a strong Sarmatian tribal confederacy between the Danube and the Don, the question being only to what period this empire might be assigned.

The report quoted from Strabo certainly presents some clues to this effect. He mentions, after describing the geographical location of the Sarmatian tribes, that the Roxolani fought under the command of their leader Tasios against the generals of Mithridates Eupator in alliance with Palakos, king of the Crimean Scythian state, but were defeated by Diophantos, one of Mithridates' generals. This event was recorded at that time in the inscription dedicated by the Chersonesians in honour of Diophantos (Dittenberger, *Syll.*³ No 709). His victory is put roughly between 110 and 106, namely about the first years of Mithridates' reign.³⁷ Accordingly Strabo's description reflects the conditions of the last decade of the second century B. C., so that we can assume the existence of the Western Sarmatian tribal confederacy in this period.

We should, however, move on much safer ground if Strabo's source or sources could be defined more closely. To this, however, we have no direct clues; in fact it is not even certain whether the whole description is taken from one source or whether it is collated from several places. The latter view is taken by Rostovtzeff who attributes — in general in Strabo's Book VII. and also in the particular passage in question — the geographical data to Artemidoros, the ethnographical descriptions to Poseidonios, and the historical parts to Hypsikrates.³⁸ This in relation to the description of the Sarmatian tribes means in practice that Strabo, in this relatively brief passage took the enumeration of the tribes from Artemidoros, his remark on the struggle of the Roxolani against Mithridates from Hypsikrates, while the description of the

³⁵ See Vasmer, 15. *Die Iranier in Südrussland* 47.

³⁶ Loc. cit. 15.

³⁷ See Niese—Hohl, *Grundriß der Römischen Geschichte*, München, 1923. p. 198; Dittenberger, *Syll.* 3 No. 709, see footnote; Münzer, *RE* XV, pp. 2164.

³⁸ *Skythien und der Bosphorus I*, pp. 92, 126 ff.

nomadic way of life and the armour of the Roxolani date from Poseidonios. We may, however, state that the unity of the construction of the description does not corroborate this view. The remark on the historical role of the Roxolani is organically linked up with the geographical enumeration, moreover the description of their armaments is added to one part of the historical remark as an explanation, as if it were to throw a light on the cause of the defeat: *πρὸς μέντοι συντεταγμένην φάλαγγα καὶ ὡπλισμένην καλῶς τὸ βάρβαρον φύλον ἀσθενὲς πᾶν ἔστι καὶ τὸ γυμνητικόν. ἐκείνοι γοῦν ... οὐκ ἀντέσχον, ἀλλ' οἱ πλείστοι διεφθάρησαν. χρώνται δὲ ὠμοβοῖνοις κράνεσι κτλ.*

Eventually the description of the Roxolanian armaments refers back to the other Sarmatian tribes: *τοιοῦτοι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων οἱ πλείους* and this is the transition to the description of nomadic ways of life. This part appears to be tacked loosely on to the end of the report and owing to this some hesitation can be seen in scientific literature too in assigning it to its proper place and stating whom it concerns. In general it is customary to connect it with the Roxolani.³⁹ Diehl, however, tries to connect it with the nomads fighting on Palakos' side.⁴⁰ The latter conjecture seems to have little foundation because there is no mention at all in the text of "nomads" fighting on the side of Palakos, on the other hand Diehl may be right in holding that the description cannot refer to the Roxolani, because the opening: *τῶν δὲ νομάδων* clearly sets them apart in contrast to the description of the Roxolani. The sentence concluding the description of the armaments of the Roxolani, on the other hand, may contain a clear indication. It refers back to the other Sarmatian tribes; the report after a more detailed treatment reverts to the enumeration of Sarmatian tribes, where as to their way of living there is only this brief sentence: *τὸ μὲν πλεόν νομάδες, ὀλίγοι δὲ κτλ.* To this the beginning *τῶν δὲ νομάδων* is a direct reference which is followed immediately by the description of nomadic ways of life. Thus no clue whatever may be derived from the structure of Strabo's report about its compilation from diverse sources, in fact the unity of its composition definitely points to an origin from one source, which may have been Poseidonios who actually dealt with the story of Palakos too (FGrHist. 87 F 32). Yet, should there remain but one possibility and should we be obliged to forego naming the source, it is indubitable that the description of Strabo dates from the time of Mithridates' campaigns in the Pontus and that it was taken from a work dealing with these. This is borne out by Strabo himself, who holds the opinion that the northern region of the Pontus, from Tyras to the Colchians, became first known from the campaigns of Mithridates and his generals (I 2, 1) and for this reason he himself used the works of the historians of Mithridates' wars as yielding the most reliable material as his source (XI 2, 14).⁴¹

3. Late Scythians and Sarmatians. The Amage Story

Apart from the fact that the context of Strabo's report clearly proves the simultaneity of the existence of a Western Sarmatian tribal confederacy under "Royal Sarmatian" leadership and of Mithridates' expansion, in the Pontic region, also from the historical events themselves, the outlines of a picture of this Western Sarmatian power stand out clearly from the end of the second century B. C. The appearance of Mithridates' generals and armies in the Greek cities of the northern coastal regions of the Black Sea was the last phase of a long historical process. From the second half

³⁹ See Rostovtzeff, *Skythien und der Bosporus I*, 93.

⁴⁰ RE VII, SpBd. 1196.

⁴¹ See K. Müllenhoff, *Deutsche Altertumskunde III*, pp. 40. Berlin, 1892.

of the fourth century B. C.⁴² the power of the Scythians was being steadily crushed by the new swarms of Iranian tribes advancing westward. Under the ever-growing pressure the Scythians were pushed more and more towards the West and South. Into this picture come undoubtedly the wars of Atheas, the Scythian king, along the lower course of the Danube against the Istrians and Triballians and lastly against Philip, King of Macedonia. That these are no longer merely predatory raids can be seen from the considerable booty looted by Philip at the defeat of Atheas; according to the report of Trogus Pompeius (Iustinus IX 2, 15): 20,000 Scythian women and children were taken prisoner and a large number of cattle captured. This shows that the Scythians had drawn the lower Danube with their families and livestock, evidently to seek new territories instead of the abandoned Donets region. The natural consequence of giving up first the Donets and eventually the Dnieper region was the split of the Scythians into, two parts.

One part retired to the Crimea while the other occupied the Dobrudja.⁴³ Both territories were well suited by their geographic position to offer points of vantage to smaller fractions of peoples to ward off attacks coming from the waves of the Migration of Peoples from the East. The Dobrudja known also by writers of late Antiquity as "Little Scythia", was held by the Scythians until the Roman Conquest, but also the other branch offered staunch resistance to the Sarmatians in the Crimea, which also bore for a time the name of Little Scythia. Thus the process of disintegration of the Scythian Empire is now clear, the remaining question, however, is the manner of how Mithridates' expansion in the Pontus comes into this and what the role of the above described strong Sarmatian power was.

In consequence of the advance of the Sarmatians, the good relations between the Greek cities of the Pontus and the Scythians which had existed for a long period, came to a speedy end. The Scythians, in consequence of their loss of valuable territories and economic resources, were more and more obliged to keep themselves above water by imposing levies on the Greek cities which they tried to bring under their power as bases for their struggle against the Sarmatians.⁴⁴ Glimpses into these events may be obtained from the Protogenes inscription and from one of the Polyainos narratives. According to the latter (VIII 56), the Chersonesians applied to Amage, queen of the Sarmatians for help in the face of the hostile attitude of the Crimean Scythian king and concluded an "alliance" with her. Amage first sent an order to the Scythian king requesting him to abstain from harassing Chersonese and when this proved of no avail, she appeared unexpectedly at the head of a small cavalry force, at the Scythian king's quarters, had the king put to death and set the dead king's son in his place as ruler of the Scythians ordering him to live in peace with the Greeks and the other neighbouring barbarians.

The date of this story is of great importance from the viewpoint of its value and of the interpretation of the events contained in it. Rostovtzeff endeavours to prove that the historical situation reflected in the Amage story corresponds to the third century B. C., and that the Sarmatians actually fought as the allies of Chersonese against the Scythians.⁴⁵ However, the character of Polyainos' narrative does not bear out this supposition. It is nevertheless true that the Chersonesians become "allies" of the Sarmatian queen, yet there is no mention of a joint warfare. Amage

⁴² See J. Harmatta, *Quellenstudien zu den Skythika des Herodot.* Budapest, 1941. p. 52.

⁴³ J. Harmatta, *Das Volk der Sadagaren: Analecta or. mem. A. Csoma de Kőrös dicata*, Budapest, 1942. pp. 24.

⁴⁴ See Rostovtzeff, *CAH VIII*, 514.

⁴⁵ *Skythien und der Bosporus I*, pp. 123.

simply instructs the Crimean Scythian king to cease hostilities against the Chersonesians and when he does not comply with the order, she does not wage war against him as might be expected in the case of a hostile power, but instead she chastises the refractory ruler at the head of a small cavalry unit and bids his successor to abstain from every hostile interference with the neighbouring Greeks and Barbarians. These details show the Sarmatians in such absolutely superior forces over the Greeks and Scythians, that the latter can hardly be thought to have been independent political factors of equal strength to the Sarmatians. Amage's attitude towards the Scythian king clearly proves that he had been her vassal. It is comprehensible only so that she should have tried to put a stop to hostilities by a simple order and only in this case was it possible to settle the matter by enforcing reprisals against the Scythian king and his entourage and only so could she place another ruler at the head of the Scythians. Amage, in consequence, did not wish to annihilate the Scythians, she merely wanted to see her interests with regard to Chersonese safeguarded.

Thus there can be no question of the Crimean Scythians having been the common enemy of both the Sarmatians and the Chersonesians, from which it follows that there is little likelihood of the Chersonesians being the equals of the Sarmatians in an alliance. On the strength of the character of the Polyainos narrative these "allied" relations should rather be given an interpretation according to which the Chersonesians, seeking protection against the Crimean Scythian king, the vassal of the Sarmatian queen, appealed to her and so became themselves vassals of the Sarmatians (*ἐδεήθησαν αὐτῆς* [sc. Ἀμάγης] *γενέσθαι σύμμαχοι*).⁴⁶ It is thus comprehensible that there was no question of any largescale campaign since the Sarmatian queen only wished for peace between her two vassals and this she attained easily by compelling the Scythian king to obedience, or rather by having him put to death for his disobedience.

Now the only remaining question is at what date the political situation unfolding from the narrative of Polyainos, may be put. There can hardly be any question of the third century B. C., which Rostovtzeff suggested. It is difficult to imagine that the Scythians or the Chersonesians should have been Sarmatian vassals at so early a date. What serious force the Scythians still represented even after the defeat at the hand of Philip at the end of the fourth century B. C., is clearly shown by the fact that they could inflict a shattering defeat at the Battle of Olbia upon the army of 30,000 of Zopyrion, a general of Alexander the Great.⁴⁷ That the Scythians at that time had fought in defence of Olbia is a proof of their having then been the protectors of the Greek cities in the Western part of the Pontic region. Though the power of the Scythians may have dwindled considerably in the course of the third century, nevertheless they still meant a menace to Olbia, according to the testimony of the Protogenes inscription from the beginning of the second century.⁴⁸ Olbia at that time already paid a heavy tribute to the Saii, a Sarmatian tribe. At the same time also Chersonese had been an independent power, as is seen from the pact (of 179 B. C.) between the

⁴⁶ It is worth observing that also according to Polyainos' own text it was the Chersonesians who had "asked for leave" to be the "allies" of the Sarmatian queen owing to the hostilities of the Scythians, thus the conclusion of this alliance was but an appeal for help. That *συνμαχία*, *σύμμαχος* namely "alliance, allies", after all merely conceal the fact of vassalage, in itself is nothing remarkable, in view of the linguistic usage of those times. We find also in the official language of inscriptions in connection with the Greek vassals of Rome the words *συνμαχία*, *σύμμαχος*; see e. g. Dittenberger, *Syll.* No. 674_{18, 41}, No 764₈, etc.

⁴⁷ Iustinus XII. 2, 16; Curtius X. 1, 44; Marcobius Sat. I 11, 33.

⁴⁸ Dittenberger, *Syll.* No. 495₁₀₆.

powers of the Pontic region, in which they figure as an independent signatory party.⁴⁹ We also know that Chersonese at that time was under heavy Scythian pressure and was for this reason obliged somewhat later to conclude a pact with Pharnaces I. in virtue of which the king at the request of the Chersonesians was to help the latter against the barbarians.⁵⁰ These events thus reflect a political situation vastly different from that of the Polyainos narrative, and so we cannot put the Amage story at this or any earlier date.

About half a century later, we find an entirely new situation but this also differs very distinctly from the historical background of the Polyainos narrative. By then the power of the Crimean Scythians had essentially increased, and the area in their sway extended as far as the Dnieper, in fact Olbia also had at a time been under their supremacy, as can be ascertained from the coins which their king Skiluros had minted.⁵¹ This state of things, however, changed considerably somewhat later. Again the power of the Crimean Scythians had been completely shrunk and the generals of Mithridates finally broke the power of the Scythians and incorporated their territory into the Bosporan kingdom.⁵² We have, however, a clue to the Crimean Scythian kingdom having no longer been an independent power even in the period between the collapse of the Crimean Scythian kingdom of Skiluros and the appearance of the generals of Mithridates. According to Strabo's report (VII 23, 17) it was the Roxolani who hastened to the help of Palakos, son of Skiluros, against Diophantos, Mithridates' general. Knowing about that long struggle carried on by the Sarmatians and Scythians and bearing in mind that the Roxolani only formed the Eastern wing of a big Sarmatian tribal confederacy, the conjecture that the Roxolani went to the help of the Crimean Scythians as an independent power becomes highly improbable. If earlier hostile relations between Scythians and Sarmatians had changed to the opposite, this could only have happened by the Crimean Scythians having become vassals of the powerful Pontic Sarmatian empire, which in its turn came to their help later against Mithridates.⁵³

Thus it seems most probable that at the time just preceding the appearance of Mithridates in the Pontus, the Crimean Scythian kingdom had indeed been the vassal of the Sarmatians, which hypothesis is borne out by the Amage story. However, we may not place the Polyainos narrative into this epoch despite this. The Chersonesians — as we know from Strabo's report (VII 4, 3) — after their city had been ravaged by the Barbarians (that is when Theodosia for a short time came into Scythian hands) were obliged to ask for the help of Mithridates Eupator. This fact is in gross contradiction to the political situation such as is seen from the Amage story. While the Sarmatians at the time seemed willing to accept the protectorship over Chersonese and also to ward off their other vassal, the Scythians, on the other hand the Chersonesians in this case had to apply for help elsewhere. This points to the Sarmatian tribal confederacy's hostile attitude at that time towards the Greek colonies in the Pontus and its support of the Crimean Scythians' attempt to occupy some Greek

⁴⁹ Polybios XXV 2.

⁵⁰ Ebert, *Südrussland im Altertum* 239; Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia* 148.

⁵¹ Ebert, *Südrussland im Altertum* 225; Regling, *RE* II. R. III pp. 526.

⁵² Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia* 149.

⁵³ Rostovtzeff also saw this correctly. *CAH* IX, 228. According to him, however, the Scythians extended their power over Olbia and the area up to the Dnieper just as the vassals of the Sarmatians. This in itself is improbable enough, because how could the Sarmatians have tolerated the Scythians spreading over their own sphere of interest, to which Olbia also belonged; apart from this, the Nike-ratos inscription also, originating from not long before Mithridates' Pontic conquests, contradicts this. See about this later.

cities. Only thus is it possible to understand that after the collapse of the power of Skiluros, the dwindled Crimean Scythian empire succeeded after all in either taking possession of one part of the Greek cities, or in looting them. It is possible that this attitude of the Sarmatians hangs together with their increasing social differentiation.⁵⁴

Thus it can be stated that the Polyainos narrative cannot refer to a time prior to the pact between Chersonese and Pharnakes I., nor to the period following the foundation of the power of Skiluros. So, there cannot be any other solution than putting it at the time between these two dates, broadly between 165 and 140 B. C. It is easy to imagine that the Sarmatians, holding at that time the Western part of the Pontic region, whose ruling tribe the Saii are familiar to us from the Protogenes inscription, had extended their supremacy also over the Crimean Scythians and, since they did not pursue an entirely hostile policy towards the Greek cities — as can be concluded from the pact of 179 B. C. — accepted as “allies” also Chersonese which had applied to them for help, and, — obviously in exchange for adequate reciprocal assistance — protected them against the Crimean Scythians.

Hence the history of the Sarmatians can be reconstructed on broad line as follows. At the beginning of the second century the aspect of a strong Sarmatian power appears for the first time. Broadly speaking it held in its sway at that time the territory between the Don and the Dnieper. Undoubtedly the backbone of this Sarmatian power was chiefly the tribe of the Saii to which also Olbia had to pay heavy tribute. The role of Gatalos, king of the Sarmatians, in the pact concluded in 179 B. C. by the powers of the Pontic region shows clearly that this Sarmatian power had been an important political factor. It seems that the lengthy struggle between the Sarmatians and Scythians which paralysed commercial and economic life in South Russia for a long period, had at that time come to a standstill to a certain extent and Sarmatian power had consolidated to such a point that commerce could once more revive. From an inscription of about 175 B. C. in honour of an Attic merchant it is clear that commerce between Attica and the Pontus was lively again, thanks to the more peaceful conditions in the wake of the Pact of 179 B. C. The extension of Sarmatian power over the Crimea and the extension of its suzerainty over the Scythians, may have occurred immediately after these times. Also the political conception of increasing commerce and economic life fits well into this picture and tallies with the acceptance of the protectorate over Greek cities, so that the Amage story might with great probability be put at this date. Also the name *Σαῖος* appearing later in Panticapaeum might testify to the Crimean rule of the Saii.⁵⁵

The fact, in the face of the process of consolidation of Sarmatian power in the Pontic region, that a decade or two later the Crimean Scythians recover their strength with extraordinary speed and reconquer from the Sarmatians the territory east of the Dnieper and even bring Olbia under their power, is indeed surprising. It is evident that the strengthening of the Crimean Scythian kingdom under Skiluros was possible only owing to the large-scale weakening and eventual collapse of Sarmatian power. There is another clue to this conjecture, namely, later as seen in Strabo's reports, a few decades after the troubled times, once more a strong Sarmatian tribal union developed. However, not one of the Sarmatian tribal names occurring in the Protogenes inscription can be found among the tribal names figuring in the Strabo enumeration. As has been shown, this symptom can have but one explanation: a new

⁵⁴ We can hardly think of the awakening of Iranian national consciousness as Ebert, *Südrußland im Altertum*. 343 did.

⁵⁵ See the name in Vasmer, *Die Iranier in Südrußland*. 50.

Iranian swarm from the East had arrived in South Russia and had completely broken up or absorbed the tribes figuring in the Protopogenes inscription.⁵⁶

This change, accompanied by great upheavals, naturally favoured greatly the restoration of the Crimean Scythian power, but the sudden growth of Scythian power came to a speedy end when under the leadership of "Royal" Sarmatians a new, strong Sarmatian tribal alliance was formed. The Scythians soon became once more the vassals of a new Sarmatian empire whose power politics were levelled at the full possession of the Greek cities. In consequence of this boosted enemy force the Greek cities in the Pontic region were obliged to apply to Mithridates Eupator for help. Thus the appearance of the troops of Mithridates in the Greek cities in the Pontic region is in close connection with the establishment of a new, strong Sarmatian tribal confederacy.

4. The Western Sarmatian Tribal Confederacy and the North Pontic Greek Cities

This picture gained mainly from the history of the Greek cities in the Crimean peninsula is corroborated by the data on Olbia. Olbia, as seen above, had been compelled to pay tribute to the Saii in the first half of the second century B. C., while about the middle of the same century she came entirely under the domination of Skiluros, the Crimean Scythian ruler. Towards the end of the second century probably Olbia too was freed from the rule of the Crimean Scythians. Two Olbian inscriptions date from this time, they to a certain extent allow a glimpse into the historical position of this city. One was erected in honour of Epikrates, an architect⁵⁷ who was on contract from Byzantium to conduct the building operations of the city and also to restore its fortifications and who stood his ground splendidly, both when the Olates, probably a Thracian tribe, threatened to wage war and also later in his capacity of technical inspector of fortifications. Hence Olbia at that time was obviously again independent and endeavoured to keep her fortifications in good shape so as to be able to resist the attacks threatening on the part of various barbarian tribes. The other inscription honoured Nikeratos (Dittenberger, *Syll.*³ No. 730). He was — as can be inferred from the inscription — the military commander of Olbia and not only held at bay the "enemy continually menacing the city" but also smoothed the internal strife of Chersonese, "steeped in continual wars". This brave soldier, however, fell a prey to the snare of the barbarians in the end. On one occasion he accompanied an Olbian group under strong military escort to the forest region beyond the Borysthenes-Dnieper, to the Hylaia, and he succeeded in getting the civilians back to the city because the enemy prepared a surprise attack, which he wanted to parry outside the walls. The enemy dared not attack him openly but set him a trap in the dead of night and so could kill him.

Thus both inscriptions prove that Olbia was under severe enemy pressure of the neighbouring barbarians and that she strove to defend herself single-handed, of her own strength. There are also certain formal clues as to the determination of the date of the inscriptions. The orthography of the Nikeratos inscription links it closely to the Aristagoras inscription (Dittenberger, *Syll.*³ No. 708) which in view of the shape of its

⁵⁶ See J. Harmatta: *Folia Ethnographica* I/2 (1949) 127. foll.

⁵⁷ Dittenberger, *Syll.*³ No. 707. The name of the city is missing from the inscription, yet there are ponderous proofs that it was Olbia, see Dittenberger, *Syll.*³ II, 339, n. 1.

characters and its spelling may not be placed at a date earlier than the end of the second century B. C., and not later than this period, according to the evidence of the coins with the Arista(goras) legend put at the second half of the second century.⁵⁸ Thus the Nikeratos inscription dates probably from 120—100 B. C., while the Epikrates inscription on which no itacistic flaws can be found yet, may have a somewhat earlier date. This is the only possible date determination also if we try in the history of Olbia to locate the events fixed in the inscription. It is obvious that the activity of both Epikrates and Nikeratos is unimaginable in Olbia under the rule of Skiluros, that is before about 130 B. C., but neither is it possible after 106 B. C. when the armies of Mithridates had taken over the defence of the Greek cities in the Pontic region.

From an inscription in honour of a ship-captain from Amisos, we know that Olbia too had placed herself under Mithridates' protection and that formations of the forces of the King of Pontus had also been stationed in this city.⁵⁹ Even if the conditions recorded in this inscription correspond to a later date (about 70—64 B. C.), the *Νεοπτολέμου πύργος* at the Dnieper estuary mentioned by Strabo (VII 4, 16) clearly proves that Olbia and her environs, had belonged to the Pontic Empire, since the military operations against the Scythians and Sarmatians,⁶⁰ led by the generals of Mithridates, Diophantos and Neoptolemos (110—106 B. C.). This is borne out by the testimony of another context (Strabo VII 4, beginning of 3), according to which Mithridates had planned the extension of his operations as far as the Dnieper and even farther west from the outset. Thus, since Olbia belonged to the Pontic Empire until Mithridates' death and since she was entirely devastated in the subsequent decade by the Getae,⁶¹ the events forming the background of the Epikrates and Nikeratos inscriptions can be put only into the period between 130—107 B. C. This result is supported by the part played by Nikeratos in Chersonese, which can also be imagined only before the appearance of Mithridates' generals. The question now is only which barbaric power meant at that time a constant threat to Olbia.

According to Dittenberger's view the barbarians menacing Olbia at the time were the Getae of Boirebistas,⁶² yet this view is undoubtedly erroneous. It would, in itself, seem probable enough that the Getae meant a danger to Olbia, it is highly improbable, however, that they should also have subdued the wooded region east of the Borysthenes, and it is precisely from this area that Nikeratos and Olbia were attacked. Besides it would be a mistake to attribute such a historical importance to Boirebistas and the Getae as early as between 130 and 107 B. C. The more recent investigations have clearly proved that Boirebistas could only have ascended the throne round about 60 B. C., thus the great increase of Dacian power began only after that.⁶³ We may therefore hardly have in mind others than the Sarmatians to have been the enemy threatening Olbia. This solution is all the more plausible since, as was stated above, the report of Strabo about the Sarmatian tribal confederacy occupying the territory between the Danube and the Don, refers to the last decade of the second century B. C., and so it is beyond doubt that the environs of Olbia also had been under the sway of the Sarmatian tribal confederacy. It would seem probable, even if no data were at our disposal, that the policy and attitude of the Sarma-

⁵⁸ See Dittenberger, *Syll.*³ II. pp. 340.

⁵⁹ See Ebert, *Südrussland im Altertum* 225, furthermore Rostovtzeff, *CAH* IX, 232.

⁶⁰ See Strabo VII 4, 18; Fr. Geyer, *RE* XV, 2168, XVI, 2465.

⁶¹ Dion Chrys. or 36, 4.

⁶² See Dittenberger, *Syll.*³ II, 393.

⁶³ A. Alföldi, *Budapest története* [The History of Budapest]. Budapest, 1943. I, 139.

tians was not different towards Olbia than towards the Crimean Greek cities. Their chief aim was to bring the Greek cities completely under their power, or at least under the power of one of their vassals. The inscriptions in honour of Epikrates and Nikeratos afford a good opportunity for looking into one phase of this process, the fight against Olbia.

Thus with its pressure upon the Greek cities the new Sarmatian tribal confederacy formed in the last decades of the second century B. C. makes its influence felt from the Crimean peninsula to the Dnieper region. There are, however, traces too which show the consequences of Sarmatian power politics to have been fully felt by Greek cities much farther west, also in the Dobrudja. Thus from inscriptions from the end of the second century B. C. which the inhabitants of Istros erected to their prominent countryman Aristagoras (Dittenberger, Syll.³ No. 708), it becomes clear that the barbarians occupied and devastated Istros also at that time. The citizens, however, in part returned later to the abandoned city, yet the danger being constant, the city had to be fortified and further clashes with the barbarians could not be avoided. Of somewhat later origin is an inscription from Tomi (Dittenberger, Syll.³ No. 731) which also testifies to the endangered position of this city too. Dittenberger assumed also with regard to these two inscriptions that the barbarians menacing Istros and Tomi may have been the Getae of Boirebistas. This is most improbable, as this territory came under Boirebistas's power only after 60 B. C.

This is clearly proved by the fact that Antonius Cicero's partner in consulship was defeated in 61 B. C. near Istros by the Scythians and their allies the Bastarnae⁶⁴, which shows that at that time Dobrudja was still in their hands. It would be much more probable to think just of these two barbarian peoples. Of the Scythians we know also that pressed westward by the Sarmatians, they had occupied Dobrudja previously. Just because of this, however, it is probable that they had more settled relations with the Greek cities. To this points the fact that their kings had money coined — obviously in the Greek cities — from which it can safely be concluded together with Rostovtzeff,⁶⁵ that both Istros and Tomi politically had belonged under the Dobrudjan Scythian kings' power. Coins of four Scythian kings, Tanusas, Kanites, Akrosas and Charaspes, are known to us, all date largely from the years 230 B. C. and 150 B. C. ⁶⁶ It is not very likely however, that Tomi and Istros should have been in so hard pressed a situation as is revealed in the two inscriptions mentioned above. It is, however, surely no coincidence that the coinage of the Scythian kings — as far as can be concluded from the material so far extant — came to an end in the last decades of the second century. The cause, evidently, was the collapse of Dobrudjan Scythian power and it was obviously in connection with the disintegration of Crimean Scythian power which occurred at about the same time. No doubt the new Sarmatian Empire formed in the last decades of the second century B. C. was the cause and it is near at hand to see the effects of this also in the Dobrudjan events.

It is highly probable that the Sarmatians, made also the Dobrudjan Scythians their vassals like the Crimeans, because the Dobrudja, just like the Crimea, was of supreme importance to them as the economic sphere of interest of a number of Greek cities. Along with this, it is also possible that they had partially occupied this territory because Strabo's above mentioned report (VII 3, 17) expressly emphasizes that the Sarmatians on the whole live their nomadic lives on both banks of the

⁶⁴ Cassius Dio XXXVIII 10,2.

⁶⁵ *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia* 86; CAH IX. 228.

⁶⁶ Regling, RE II, R. VIII 2230.

Danube. It is easy to imagine how much the advance of the Sarmatians into the Dobrudja transformed the position of the Greek cities: they came into a position as menaced as Olbia or the Crimean Greek cities in the same period.

5. Mithridates VI and the Sarmatians

Thus it can easily be ascertained even from the incomplete material extant, that in the last decades of the second century B. C. from the Don to the Danube a strong Sarmatian tribal confederacy must be reckoned with. Its suzerainty extended even over the Crimean and Dobrudjan Scythians, moreover, it aimed at the complete occupation of the Greek cities in the Pontus partly by itself and partly by its vassals. In consequence the Greek cities' situation was extremely critical and eventually they had no other choice but to apply for help to the greatest potentate of the Pontic region of the time, to Mithridates. Mithridates succeeded, thanks to his military superiority, in liberating the Greek cities from Scythian and Sarmatian pressure, however, this by no means meant the full smashing up of Sarmatian strength. Despite this the appearance of Mithridates meant an important turning point both from the point of view of the Greek cities and of the Scythians, or the Sarmatians. This self-confident and ambitious personality recognized clearly that the possession of the Greek cities in the Pontus would only then mean a considerable source of strength for him if he could restore their economic life and trade. This had one pre-condition, namely to establish adequate political and commercial ties with the Scythians and Sarmatians under whose control the economic and commercial sphere of interest of the Greek cities had been.

That is why a great change must be observed in the policy of Mithridates towards the Scythians and Sarmatians after the immediate danger threatening the Greek settlements had been averted. As soon as his power in the Crimean peninsula was consolidated, he endeavoured to establish friendly relations with them, instead of the hostile attitude prevailing until then. His person and personality were both very suitable for that. On his father's side he could trace his ancestry right back to Cyrus and Darius, while on his mother's side he could boast of Alexander the Great as his ancestor, a ruler who stood in the highest esteem with the Iranian peoples. In addition, his regal appearance, his admirable horsemanship and huntsmanship were all important assets in the eyes of equestrian peoples. It suffices to recall that Darius also boasts in the Naqš-i-Rustam inscription: "as a rider I am a good one" (DNb 41—2: *asabāra uvāsabāra amiy*) and even later the Parthians drove away one of their kings, Vonones because he neglected hunting and did not care for horses (Tacitus, *Annales* II 2: *raro venatu, segni equorum cura*). Mithridates, in addition to all these, had an almost demoniacal will power and a most impressive personality and thanks to his great linguistic talent he could speak to all his subjects and allies in their mother tongue.⁶⁷ In short, the figure of Mithridates to the barbarian peoples of the Pontus suggested and called to life the memory of the almost legendary Persian "great king" and of the "world conquering Alaksandar" and thus it is no wonder that they stood by him up to the end, also at the time when the Greeks of the Pontus had turned from him. Naturally besides his personal charm he also used other means of winning the barbarians of the Pontus. He married his daughters to barbarian chiefs and gave them splendid presents to assure their loyalty. In consequence of this far-sighted and

⁶⁷ See Mommsen's characterization, pat in many regards, *Römische Geschichte* II, pp. 265.

conscious policy, every people of the Pontic region was represented in his army, so that he had at his disposal inexhaustible manpower at the time of the war waged against the Romans. That he succeeded in winning the Sarmatians for himself is proved clearly by a report of Appianos (Mithr. 19), according to which he used Sarmatian cavalry as his vanguard as early as in the first war against the Romans.

Apart from this our sources also mention continually the Sarmatians as his allies.⁶⁸ This shows that he could after the initial hostilities establish lasting good relations with them which might have been inspired in addition to his personal charm and clever diplomacy also by common economic and political interest. Undoubtedly the Sarmatians were in sore need of the industrial goods made or distributed in the Greek cities of the Black Sea. There is no better evidence of this than the fact that after the Getae had devastated their town, the Olbians returned to its site as a result of the persuasion of the "Scythians" (=Sarmatians) and founded Olbia again.⁶⁹ Accordingly, it was in the interest of the Sarmatians to be on good terms with the king of the Pontus who held the Greek cities in his power. As to political aims, it may have been Mithridates' old plan to attack the Romans by land, from the North, *i. e.* from the Pontus as well. To this effect, along with the other Pontic peoples, the strong Sarmatian tribal confederacy could be used appropriately, therefore it is probable that Mithridates approved, and possibly encouraged, the spreading of the Sarmatians to the West. For the Sarmatians, on the other hand, this was the only possibility of expansion after the occupation of the Greek cities of the Pontus by Mithridates, besides, the possession of the Roumanian plain and the Dobrudja was always highly desirable to the peoples of the steppes.

Keeping in view the concurrence of the political and economic interests of Mithridates and the Sarmatians, one of Strabo's data gains particular moment, that the Sarmatians used to put their quarters also along the banks of the Danube and often stayed on both her banks. This information is usually so interpreted that single roving or fleeing Sarmatian swarms avoiding the Bastarnae reached the southern banks of the Danube as early as in the course of the first century B. C.⁷⁰ This view, however, is not correct, because Strabo's report as was seen above, refers to conditions in the last decade of the second century B. C. In addition, also the manner of expression of Strabo gives no clue to this hypothesis, because his remark *τούτους φασὶ καὶ παρὰ τὸν Ἰστρον οἰκεῖν, ἐφ' ἑκάτερα πολλάκις* does not stress any groups, but refers to the Sarmatians who had been mentioned in the text before. Besides, the verb *οἰκεῖν* indicates systematic, protracted sojourn and not roving.

Thus it is a much more probable assumption that the Sarmatians at certain fixed intervals camped regularly by the Danube. There can be no doubt as to the Sarmatians — in true nomadic shepherdlike fashion —, having constantly changed their pastures. In fact Strabo remarks about them that they are largely nomads, furthermore, when characterizing the nomad ways of life he even reports the observation made by his source, namely that they "follow the pastures, always seeking the places which yield grass" (VII 3, 17). Nor has it escaped the attention of ancient observers that the seasons had a decisive importance in the choice of pastures. Strabo reports, as a continuation of the quoted passage, the fact about the Sarmatians living near to the Maeotis, namely that they spend the winters among the swamps of the Maeotis, whereas the summers are spent on the plains. That the nomads had the

⁶⁸ Appianos, Mithr. 15, 69; Iustinus XXXVIII 3, 6.

⁶⁹ Dio Chrys., Log. Borysth. p. 49. Ed. Dindorf.

⁷⁰ See A. Alföldi, *Budapest története* [History of Budapest]. I, 180.

habit of putting their winter quarters round rivers and lakes, can be ascertained from many sources. However, it may suffice to remind of Ibn Rusta's report on the Magyars "their abodes are between these two rivers (Don and Danube). When winter comes, those (tribes) who are near to one of these two rivers, draw up to it and spend the winter on its banks".⁷¹ Considering that the Sarmatian tribal confederacy described by Strabo, like the Magyars, occupied the territory between the Don and Danube, they may have changed about their winter and summer quarters similarly.

Thus it seems very probable that Strabo's report must be so interpreted that the Sarmatian winter quarters were by the Danube and often both banks were occupied. It would be difficult to understand the latter part of the report if it were the question of roving Sarmatian swarms settling down or intruding south of the Danube. Why should Strabo in this case emphasize that the Sarmatians very often stayed on "both" banks? It is a feature easy to observe with Southern Russian and Asiatic nomads that certain tribal systems, or often single tribes, settle on both banks of rivers, or reaches of rivers, evidently in order to secure the water supply of their live-stock.⁷² Such bilateral settlements can be found also at the settling of Magyar tribes occupying Hungary.⁷³ Thus we may assume that the Sarmatians also endeavoured to settle down on both banks of the Danube and one part of their quarters was on the southern bank.

It is possible that the same situation is reflected in Ovid, who repeatedly mentions the Sarmatian carts crossing the frozen Danube.⁷⁴ The interpretation of Ovid's data is contested — Patsch had in mind the goods traffic going across the icebound river,⁷⁵ while Alföldi thought of predatory raids⁷⁶ — we can nevertheless state that the picture of Sarmatian ox-carts traversing the frozen Danube is nowhere in direct connection with the plunderings of the Sarmatians, which by the way are frequently mentioned, whereas Ovid never even as much as mentions goods traffic. Apart from this too, it is difficult to imagine nimble mobile nomadic troops to have encumbered themselves with heavy ox-carts. It is far more probable to surmise here too that the Sarmatians for a while, even after the annexation of the Dobrudja by the Romans (probably until the Iazyges moved to Hungary) in the winter drew as for down to the Southern bank of the Danube and spent the winter months there. This would, at the same time explain why Ovid mentions the Sarmatians alongside with the Getae as the inhabitants of the environs of Tomi (Tristia V 7, 11) and on the whole, only the frequent and protracted presence of the Sarmatians, renders it feasible that they constantly occur together with the Getae and that he learnt the language of both the Getae and the Sarmatians (Tristia V 12, 58) even if this is only a poetic figure of speech. It is natural that the frequent appearance of nomadic Sarmatians may easily have gone hand in hand not only with bartering but also with robbing. It may thus be probable that the Sarmatian objective was focused — at the time of Ovid's stay at Tomi, — on a bilateral position at the Danube and in this connection on the occupation of the territories on the right bank of the Danube.

⁷¹ See K. Czeglédy, *A magyarság őstörténete* [Prehistory of the Magyars]. ed. L. Ligeti. Budapest, 1943. pp. 106.

⁷² See A. Alföldi, *A kettős királyság a nomádoknál* [Double Kingship with Nomads]. Károlyi-Emlékkönyv. Budapest, 1933. p. 29.

⁷³ See Recently E. Moór, *A honfoglaló magyarság megtelepülése és a székelyek eredete* [Settling Down of the Magyars in Hungary and the Origin of the Széklers]. Szeged, 1944. pp. 8, 11.

⁷⁴ Tristia III 10, 34; 12, 30; Epist. ex Ponto IV 7, 9—10.

⁷⁵ *Beiträge zur Völkerkunde von Südosteuropa. V 1*, 118.

⁷⁶ A. Alföldi, *Budapest története* [History of Budapest]. I, 178.

6. The Sarmatians on the Lower Danube

The fact that the Sarmatians set foot on both banks of the Danube had a double importance for Mithridates. In the first place a certain amount of pressure was brought to bear upon the peoples of the Northern Balkans, who in their turn rushed down upon Macedonia and the Roman provinces which they harassed all the time with raids and plundering and penetrated in this way as far south as Greece, right to Delphi. On the other hand being in possession of Danubian fords and bases on the southern bank, the Sarmatians themselves could easily penetrate into the Balkans and march against the Romans. From a strategic point of view this was of utmost importance to Mithridates. The Romans, on the other hand, faced with the lack of an adequate fleet, could not for a long time acquire naval superiority and since their main supply and reserve lines to Asia Minor went across the Balkans, Mithridates could easily endanger these by the help of the Sarmatians and the other Northern Balkan peoples.

Thus we cannot wonder at this territory having become a sort of sideshow theatre of war during the Ist Mithridatic War. Already Sulla had been obliged on the occasion of his march on Asia Minor, to check the Northern Balkan tribes, yet he could not obtain lasting results, because the Macedonian governors in the subsequent years too had to lead one campaign after the other against these martial barbaric peoples. After Sulla, L. Cornelius Scipio., then Ap. Claudius Pulcher, C. Scribonius Curio, and finally M. Terentius Varro Lucullus continued them from 85 B. C. (Sulla) to 71 B. C. (Lucullus), yet without achieving lasting results, albeit, Lucullus succeeded in occupying the Greek cities Apollonia, Kallatis, Tomi and Istros, which had been military bases of Mithridates.⁷⁷ That these fights in reality belong to the scope of the Mithridatic War, was clear all along, yet one date deserves special attention: Ap. Claudius Pulcher in course of his operations penetrated as far as the Sarmatians.⁷⁸ This proves that the Romans in an attempt to ward off the pressure weighing on them from the Northern Balkans found themselves in course of the campaign up against the Sarmatians, who were the last dynamic force. At the time, however, there was no possibility as yet to break Sarmatian strength and that is just why Roman efforts were ineffective against the other barbarian tribes; Sarmatian expansion forced these again and again either as their foe or their ally against the Romans.

Thus it seems probable that the Sarmatian tribal confederacy under "Royal" Sarmatian leadership played an important role — even if only indirectly — during Mithridates' campaigns in the development of Balkan events. This naturally was possible only if they held the Danube line, also the right bank in their hands. That this was so the case is clearly proved by the above mentioned report of Strabo, the question only is to what extent Sarmatian power expanded and to which territory on the right bank of the Danube. Inscriptions revealing the hard pressed position of Istros and Tomi afford certain clues to this effect. On the strength of these we might consider it probable that the Sarmatians held at least the right bank of the Danube in the Dobrudja. It should, however, not be overlooked that with the conquests of Mithridates in the Pontus, here too, it may be assumed that the situation had changed.

From the information of Florus that Lucullus in his Thracian campaign which comes under the Mithridatic Wars occupied Istros, Tomi, Kallatis and Apollonia, it is clear that the Thracian coastal region and its Greek cities were under Mithrida-

⁷⁷ See Niese—Hohl, *Grundriß der römischen Geschichte*, pp. 203. ff., 214 ff.

⁷⁸ Florus, *Epitomae* I 214, 39,6.

tes' sway. Recently, however, an inscription from Apollonia came to light which fully bears out this conjecture.⁷⁹ From this it is clear that Mithridates also sent military formations to assist the city, thus it is beyond doubt that Apollonia and along with it evidently also Istros, Kallatis and Tomi had belonged to his empire. Therefore it is only justified to assume that Mithridates exonerated the Greek cities in the Dobrudja also from Sarmatian pressure and in consequence more peaceful relations developed between Greeks and Sarmatians. If in this way Mithridates stemmed Sarmatian expansion in the Dobrudja, it all the more concurred with his interests that they should southwards expand from a farther western position. Considering all this, the possibility must be taken into account that Strabo's report, according to which the Sarmatians had occupied both banks of the Danube, does not refer to the Dobrudjan Danube course alone, but also to other parts of the Thracian banks of the Danube.

If this conjecture is examined more closely, we may safely state that the Sarmatian expansion to the South of the Danube was a well observed phenomenon and so it could not have been a fact the significance of which was minimized at the beginning of the first century B. C. Regarding this, there is another passage of Strabo (VII 3, 2): *καὶ γὰρ νῦν ἀναμέμικται ταῦτα τὰ ἔθνη* (sc. *Σκυῖται καὶ Σαρμάται*) *τοῖς Θραξὶ καὶ τὰ Βασταρνικά, μᾶλλον μὲν τοῖς ἐκτὸς Ἰστρου, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἐντὸς*. This report originates without doubt from Poseidonios (87 F 104) and the adverb "now too" is of special importance. This cannot be Strabo's expression, because in his time the situation such as it appears in the report, is unimaginable. Thus we can only assume that it also comes from the original text of Poseidonios and from it we may gain one more valuable proof of the Sarmatian south-of-Danube drive having occurred in Poseidonios' time, that is to say the period of the Mithridatic Wars.

Besides, from the reference to the Scythians and Bastarnae it may be concluded that this date too can only refer to the Dobrudja. There is, however, in Strabo's report on the southward drive of the Sarmatians another detail also, from which it can be inferred that this is not necessarily to be concluded. Strabo here mentions the Sauromatians = Sarmatians likewise with the Scythians and Bastarnae, in addition to which also the scene of the events can be determined more accurately from the report: VII 3, 13 ... *καὶ τὸ τῶν Τριβαλλῶν δ' ἔθνος, Θρακικὸν ὄν, τὸ αὐτὸ πέπονθε τοῦτο* (sc. *τὸ ἀναμεμῖχθαι*), *μεταναστάσεις γὰρ δέδεκται, τῶν πλησιοχώρων ἐς τοὺς ἀσθενεστεροὺς ἐξαναστάντων, τῶν μὲν ἐκ τῆς περσικῆς Σκυθῶν καὶ Βασταρνῶν καὶ Σαυροματῶν ἐπικρατούντων πολλάκις, ὥστε καὶ ἐπιδιαβαίνειν τοῖς ἐξελαθεῖσι καὶ καταμένειν τινὰς αὐτῶν ἢ ἐν ταῖς νήσοις ἢ ἐν τῇ Θράκῃ τῶν δ' ἐκ θατέρου μέρους ὅπ' Ἰλλυριῶν μάλιστα κατισχυομένων*. That this report can also only refer to the period of the Mithridatic Wars, or shortly before it admits of no doubt in view of the above arguments.

Thus according to this report, the Sarmatian drive south of the Danube (together with the Sarmatians also the Scythians and Bastarnae are mentioned) at the beginning of the first century B. C. also affected the Triballians. Thus from the Triballians one more clue may be gained to the Sarmatian expansion. Though it is rather difficult to give a precise description of the territory occupied by the Triballians, it is, however, beyond doubt that it included roughly the area between the Morava and the Oescus.⁸⁰ This geographical framework may be even further restricted from our point of view, because Triballian territory extended on the Danube line towards the West probably only as far as Ratiaria, since the settling down of the "Little" Scordiscians west of the Morava.⁸¹ Hence, we may localize the south-of-Danube drive of the

⁷⁹ See T. V. Borozdina, VDI 1946, 3/17 pp. 197.

⁸⁰ See E. Polaschek, RE II. VI 2396.

⁸¹ Strabo VII 5, 12. Polaschek RE II. VI, 2396, 2400.

Sarmatians, on the strength of this report, roughly in the territory between Vidin and the Isker. This naturally does not rule out the seizure of other Danubian right-bank territories, though it is possible that the occupation of the southern bank of the Danube section between Vidin and the Isker was carried out to strict schedule from the outset. This area yielded excellent vantage ground for filing up through the Nestos valley into the heart of the Balkans, from which the Triballians had often profited.⁸² It may thus be assumed that the Sarmatians too were led when occupying this Danubian section by the desire to establish a convenient bridgehead for possible Balkan adventures.

In this way the Sarmatian penetration of Triballian territory, may have been in line with the broad, large-scale political objectives of Mithridates against Rome. Strabo, however, mentions along with the Sarmatians also the Scythians and Bastarnae and so emerges the question of what connection there may have been between the penetration of these two peoples into Triballian territory with Sarmatian penetration. Considering that the Sarmatians at that time formed a strong tribal confederacy under central leadership, under the power of which the whole territory between the Don and the Danube fell, therefore it seems improbable that the Bastarnae and Scythians should have been equivalent in strength and hence independent political factors of the Sarmatians. As to the Scythians, it was successfully attempted above to prove to a certain extent that they had been the vassals of the Sarmatians and thus we may assume that the Bastarnae too at the time were obliged to recognize the suzerainty of the Sarmatians, even if they preserved to a certain degree their independence. That the Bastarnae belonged to the Sarmatian sphere of power is borne out by the fact that they had taken over several important, cultural elements from these,⁸³ and by the evidence given by Tacitus (*Germania* 46) that their nobles intermarried with the Sarmatians. It may therefore be assumed that the Bastarnian and Scythian intrusion into Triballian territory either was due to Sarmatian orders, or was effected in alliance with them, in any case it was in close cooperation with them.

In this construction it is of special importance that this was not the first intrusion of the Bastarnae in this direction towards the territory south of the Danube. Much earlier, in 179 B. C., in alliance with Philip, king of Macedonia, strong Bastarnian forces had crossed the Danube. Philip wanted the Bastarnae first to occupy the territory of the Dardani in order that they should then intrude with the Scordisci into Northern Italy. Although his death foiled this plan, one Bastarnian fraction, notwithstanding set foot on Dardanian territory and only three years later was it possible for the Dardani to drive them out.⁸⁴ These antecedents of this Sarmato-Bastarnian-Scythian expansion during the Ist Mithridatic War, are all the more interesting as they show Mithridates' plans to have been very similar to Philip's designs of attacking Italy on land from the Balkans. Thus it is easily possible that the intrusion of these peoples on Triballian territory happened at his instigation. That this territory had strategic importance is clearly shown by the fact that the Bastarnae much later, after Boirebistas' death, again penetrating into this South-Danubian territory and setting foot on the land of the Dentheletians, south of what is to-day Sofia, marched across Triballian territory.⁸⁵

The occupation of the southern or Triballian bank of the Danube carried out in cooperation with the Sarmatians in the course of the Ist Mithridatic War, fits orga-

⁸² E. g. the assault on Abdera, see Polaschek, RE II. VI, 2393.

⁸³ See Fr. Altheim, *Die Krise der Alten Welt. I.* Berlin—Dahlem, 1943. p. 88.

⁸⁴ See L. Schmidt, *Geschichte der Ostgermanen.* Berlin, 1910. p. 460.

⁸⁵ Cassius Dio LI 23, 3; see in this connection Polaschek RE II. VI, 2393.

nically into the gap between the two Bastarnian southward thrusts, although the appearance of the Scythians so far in the West is somewhat unusual. Though the Dobrudjan Scythians may have been at that time the vassals of the Sarmatians, so that cooperation with them is feasible enough, however, there is little likelihood of their return to the area north of the Danube and to their subsequent moving back to the Triballians across of the Danube. What might be conjectured, however, is that some Scythian fractions pressed westward by the Sarmatians had reached the territory of Little Roumania earlier while their bulk occupied Dobrudja. The rhyton of Poroina may be regarded as an archaeological trace of this Scythian group which had got as far as the Iron Gates. It originated most probably from the beginning of the second century B. C.⁸⁶ This western Scythian fraction may also have come under Sarmatian rule at the beginning of the first century B. C. and may have invaded Triballian territory together with them.

The gist of this historical event is probably contained in an enumeration by Pliny, in which the Sarmatians and Scythians also appear south of the Danube in Thrace: *aversa eius [sc. Haemi] et in Histrum devexa Moesi, Getae, Aedi, Scaugdae, Clariaeque et sub iis Arraei Sarmatae, quos Areatas vocant, Scythaeque ... optinent* (Nat. hist. IV 41). We cannot take into account the Sarmatians between the Haemus and the Danube, prior to the first half of the 1st c. so that the Arraei Sarmatae of Pliny, can be identical only with the Sarmatians who invaded Triballian territory as mentioned by Strabo. That Strabo does not enumerate any Sarmatian tribe of this name, does not signify much, because the name of Arraei⁸⁷ probably only meant they were "Aryans",⁸⁸ thus it may not have been a tribal connotation. So the name of Arraei is no obstacle to identifying Pliny's Sarmatians with those mentioned by Strabo, it may at the most mean that Pliny's report comes from another source. Hence Pliny preserved an independent historical tradition for us. It is important that in Pliny's enumeration the Scythians come after the Sarmatians. The Dobrudjan Scythians he mentions later separately (IV 44), thus we find also in Pliny a Scythian group apart from the above. All this shows that the circumstances given by him essentially agree with Strabo's and that they originate from a source which probably gave a geographical picture of the period of the Mithridatic Wars.

7. Chronology of the Rise and Fall of the Western Sarmatian Tribal Confederacy

Thus the picture of a Sarmatian power which is easily tangible also in its historical effects, unfolds itself clearly from the reported sources, in fact it can be ascertained without doubt that its existence, at least in part coincides with the Pontic expansion of Mithridates Eupator. In addition, certain clues are extant as to the upper and lower time limit of the existence of this historically so important Sarmatian tribal confede-

⁸⁶ See Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*. 105. *Skythien und der Bosphorus*. I, 490.

⁸⁷ We may conjecture that the names "Arraei" and "Areatae" are linguistically connected. In this case the form "Arraei" must be a corruption of the original "Arei", "Arii" or perhaps "Ariai:" which indeed might derive from *arya-*. The form of *Areatae*, on the other hand, might be a variant of the same word with the plural ending *-i*, *-tā* known from Ossetian, Sogdian or Yaghnobian, namely from those languages with which Sarmatian is most closely connected. Thus the signification of both names is probably "Aryan", "Aryans", which was evidently the general denomination used by these Sarmatians of themselves. A good parallel to this is the name *ir*, *iron*, the Eastern Ossetians gave themselves which equally derives from the word *arya* or *ārya*.

⁸⁸ See Vasmer, *Die Iranier in Südrußland*. 33.

racy. A good clue to the lower limit is the report of Appianos (Mithr. 69) according to which Mithridates when preparing his second campaign against the Romans, secured among others also the participation of the "Royal" Sarmatians (*Σαυροματῶν οἱ τε βασιλῆιοι*). Geyer puts this date of Appianos between 80 and 74 B. C.,⁸⁹ since however, we may not assume any serious preparations by Mithridates prior to Sulla's death, this timing may be narrowed down to between 78 and 74 B. C., in fact with some likelihood even to 76 and 74 B. C. Hence, about 75 B. C. the "Royal" Sarmatians and the tribal confederacy, which is inferred from this tribal denomination, was still a significant power factor.

On the other hand, not much later than 60 B. C. began the sudden increase of Boirebistas and the Dacians' power, in the course of which, within a few years, they came to possess not only the Roumanian plain and Dobrudja, but the whole territory as far as Olbia. It is evident that this large-scale expansion of the Dacians was possible only after the collapse of Sarmatian power. Thus the conclusion is that the strong tribal confederacy under "Royal" Sarmatian leadership had broken up by about 60 B. C. and so the Sarmatians thus disintegrated could no longer preserve even the Roumanian Plain, let alone their South-Danubian conquests. The dissolution of the Sarmatian tribal confederacy is clear also from the fact that we no longer hear of "Royal" Sarmatians after the report of Appianos, while later sources only mention the other Sarmatian tribes. That this event was felt as early as about 60 B. C. is seen also from the defeat which Antonius, Cicero's partner in the consulship, suffered at the hands of the Scythians and their allies the Bastarnae in 61 B. C. in Dobrudja near Istros, which shows that at this time the Sarmatians were no longer in that area. Accordingly, we may put the dissolution of the tribal confederacy, brought about by the "Royal" Sarmatians, at between 75 and 61 B. C.

As to the formation of this strong Sarmatian power, so much is certain — as was seen — that Mithridates at the time of his expansion in the Pontic region, had found himself face to face with it, therefore its foundation must be conjectured to have been earlier. Considering, however, that the appearance of Mithridates in the northern coastal region of Pontus is closely connected with the expansion of the Sarmatian tribal confederacy, its foundation may not be put at a much earlier date. This is rendered impossible also by the fact that hardly a decade or two earlier, the domination of the Crimean Scythians extended as far as Olbia and their king Skiluros had even money coined in that city. On the other hand, according to one of Strabo's data (VII 4, 3) Skiluros himself was still alive when Mithridates' generals began their operations in the Crimea, although by then his son Palakös may have played the chief part. In any case, so much is clear that Skiluros lived through the height of Crimean Scythian power and survived its downfall, therefore, if he had even been ruling for 40 years when about 108 B. C. the troops of Mithridates appeared in the Crimea, we could not put the foundation of a strong tribal confederacy under "royal" Sarmatian leadership prior to 130 B. C. This is quite in keeping with the fact that we learn of the new Sarmatian power formation for the first time from a report of Strabo dealing with the Mithridatic campaigns, thus from a source recording the geographical picture of this epoch. Hence, the formation of the new Sarmatian power may roughly be put between 130 and 108, yet as we must place within these limits also the Epikrates and Nikeratos inscriptions which look back upon several years' events, but infer the existence of the new Sarmatian power, this interval with much likelihood may be narrowed down to between 130 and 120 B. C.

⁸⁹ RE XV, pp. 2179.

In this respect there is one more clue. In a passage (II 5, 7) Strabo reports Hipparchos' view on the size and shape of the oikumene and points out that above the Borysthenes, in the north farthest from "the known Scythians", there are Roxolani. In itself it would be difficult to decide whether the information originates from Hipparchos or whether it is Strabo's addition. The latter is borne out by the whole passage having the character of an incidental remark and is a little irrelevant in the enumeration of data concerning the size and distances of the oikumene. Despite this, however, we may find it probable that this information comes from Hipparchos. When mention is made of the Roxolani a remark is added, namely that these are more in the south than the known people living on the farthest spot north of Britannia.

This remark is comprehensible only in Hipparchos, because he put Britannia on the same latitude as Borysthenes and held Thule — probably after Pytheas — to be the northernmost point of the oikumene. Strabo, on the other hand, imagined Byzantium to have been much more in the north than Massalia while he considered the distance between the latter and Britannia as well as the distance between Byzantium and Borysthenes equal, therefore, the Roxolani living in the north farthest from Borysthenes, could not have been more in the south than the people who lived farthest north of Britannia. Thus it seems probable that Hipparchos knew the Roxolani. The activity of this eminent astronomer of antiquity probably took place in the second half of the second century B. C.⁹⁰, astronomic observations from him date back to between 146 and 126 B. C.⁹¹ Even though it is not entirely impossible that his activity reached as far as into the last decades of that century, nevertheless we may place his information on the Roxolani with greatest likelihood at the most in the time of his last known astronomical observations, *i. e.* in the years round about 125 B. C. The mentioning of the Roxolani at that time, shows that the new Sarmatian power was an important factor by then and that even their remotest tribes were known.

8. The Sarmatians and the Yüeh-chih Migration

According to these, the formation of the Sarmatian tribal confederacy under "Royal" Sarmatian leadership and the appearance of the constituent tribes between the Don and Dnieper, may be put between 130 and 125 B. C. This relatively accurate definition helps in an attempt to find further connections with this event. Historical research, some time ago recognized that the Eastern European peoples' movements were in close connection with the shaping of Western Asiatic history. Accordingly, up to now several attempts have been made to clear the Eastern roots of Sarmatian movements. In this direction it was Vernadsky who went farthest by trying to take hold of the Eastern origin and relations of the Sarmatians by means of identifying the peoples' names occurring partly in Greek, Latin and partly in Chinese sources.⁹² However, the identifications of such names, which form the basis of his experiment do not hold good,⁹³ so that we may safely dismiss the discussion of this theory.

Also Rostovtzeff dealt with this question and ventured on a hypothesis that the beginning of South-Russian Sarmatian expansion to the West was connected with the Eastern events of Alexander the Great's age, the appearance of the Iazyges, Roxolani,

⁹⁰ See H. Berger, *Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Erdkunde der Griechen*. Leipzig, 1903. p. 459.

⁹¹ See Rehm, RE VII, 1666.

⁹² See *Ancient Russia*, pp. 82, 88.

⁹³ See Harmatta, RHC V (1947), 232.

Aorsians, and Siracians with the Sako-Parthian movements while the appearance of the Alans hangs together with the Yüeh-chih migration.⁹⁴ This conjecture underwent modification by Altheim, inasmuch as he put the beginning of Sarmatian movements at the beginning of the second century B. C. and thus linked up the Western expansion of Sarmatian tribes in general with the birth of the Parthian empire and with the Tocharian-Saka migration.⁹⁵ It is, however, indubitable — as has been shown by Junge⁹⁶ — that the beginning of Sarmatian movements goes back to much earlier times and so cannot be directly connected with the Tocharian-Saka migration called forth by the birth of the Hsiung-nu power. In addition, the fact must be taken into account that the Western drive of Sarmatian tribes went forth in several waves, it was a rather complex process, the phases of which must be put to the test one by one from the point of view of motive forces. Thus Altheim's hypothesis cannot be accepted, Rostovtzeff's theory is likewise too vague and lax, let alone that the appearance of Iazyges and Roxolani in South Russia, in this case should have to be put practically one century earlier, which is grossly at variance with the given data of the sources.

So much, however, seems clear that the historical events which can be observed during the 2nd century B. C. in the life of the Pontic Sarmatians are somehow connected with the great movements called forth by the birth of the Hsiung-nu empire. This may now be more closely defined by the help of the more accurate chronology of Eastern and Western events. As was seen, the birth of the new Sarmatian power under "Royal" Sarmatian leadership was probably an accomplished fact by 125 B. C. When this process began cannot be ascertained with accuracy, yet it may not have begun much earlier, because prior to this Skiluros, still alive in 107/108, had money coined in Olbia. Nor may the dissolution of the Saian power be put at a date approximately two decades earlier, owing to the Amage story, so that the chronology of events may probably be established thus: about 145 or 140 B. C. the power of the Sarmatians known from the Protogenes inscription as Saii, declined and simultaneously the Crimean Scythians once more recovered their strength and extended their suzerainty as far as the Dnieper.

This situation suddenly changed after 130 B. C. when — in the Western part of the Pontus — the new Sarmatian tribes: the "Royal" Sarmatians, the Iazyges, Urgi, and Roxolani appeared or took shape through the coalescence of newly arrived Iranian elements with the Sarmatians who had been living there before they united and seized the territory between the Danube and the Don. From this it is evident that the event responsible for the formation of the new Sarmatian power, or the appearance of the new Sarmatian tribes, had to occur in the East round about 130 B. C. However, in addition to this another earlier agent asserting itself round about 150/145 must be taken into account as well.

These conclusions are in complete harmony with the chronology of Eastern events. As is known, the migration of the Yüeh-chih, to which the Hsiung-nu had given impetus, occurred in two phases. The first of the two may be put — according to the careful estimation of Haloun — round about 174—160 B. C., in fact a slightly

⁹⁴ *Skythien und der Bosphorus*. I 609; for general reference: *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, pp. 114.

⁹⁵ WaG II (1936), 320; McGovern, *The Early Empires of Central Asia*. Chapel Hill, 1939. p. 424 n. 12 attributes the westward drive of the Sarmatians to the pressure of the Hsiung-nu, yet without expounding his conception in detail.

⁹⁶ J. Junge, *Saka-Studien. Der ferne Nordosten im Weltbild der Antike*. Klio. Beiträge zur alten Geschichte. XLI. Beiheft. Leipzig, 1939. p. 94, n. 5.

later date does not seem to be out of question either.⁹⁷ In the course of this process the Yüeh-Chih drove the Sacae away from their old territory,⁹⁸ and these in their turn, according to Junge's thorough arguments, occupied Kashmir by 155 B. C. at the latest.⁹⁹ Although Chinese sources known only of this large-scale southward Saka migration, it is highly probable that this event led to such an extensive dispersion of Saka tribes, that it was felt also in the West. One Chinese report, in fact, mentions (Han-shu, 96. c., s. v. Chi-pin) that Saka tribes spread out and founded small states in several places, yet as may be expected this report refers only to the Sacae who remained within the orbit of the Chinese. On the whole it is difficult even to engage in guesswork as to why and how far this blow affecting the Eastern Sacae concerned the Saka tribes living on the steppes of Western Turkestan, though one datum of Ptolemaios affords a certain clue. He mentions when describing Asiatic Sarmatia (V 8, 13) a people in the Caucasus whom he calls Σακαοί, by which no doubt a Saka fraction drifted to the far West must be understood.¹⁰⁰

It is thus probable that simultaneously with the migration of the bulk of the Eastern Sacae there were also certain shifts to the West, the effects of which reached also the Pontic Sarmatians and resulted in the weakening and eventual disintegration of the power of the tribes mentioned in the Protogenes inscription: It we consider that this could only have been a rather slow process, and that 10—15 years must have elapsed before effects could be felt far in the West, we arrive at the above conjectured date concerning the earlier agent asserting itself in the history of the Western Sarmatians. Haloun¹⁰¹ puts the second phase of the migration of the Yüeh-chih between 133 and 129 B. C., however, if Junge's assumption that we must see Tochari (Yüeh-chih) in the "Scythians" called by Phraates II. to his assistance in 130/129 B. C.,¹⁰² is correct, only the upper limit of the interval can be taken into account. That is when the Yüeh-chih occupy Bactria and this event was bound to make its effect felt on the Western Turkestan steppes. It is probable that this powerful thrust of the Yüeh-chih forced also other Iranian tribes to move westward.

This process is to a certain extent easy to grasp on the grounds of our sources. We know from Chinese sources (Han-shu 96/I, Shih-chi 123) that at the time when the Yüeh-chih migration was concluded, a people named Yen-ts'ai lived in the region of Lake Aral; Hirth and Gutschmid also recognized that behind this name are hidden the Aorsians, well known from both Greek and Latin sources.¹⁰³ They and the Siracians according to Strabo, who reported on them first lived on the steppes east of the Don (XI 5, 9), yet it was not here they had their original seats, they had fled from the Aorsians living farther up in the North. These Aorsians, "living farther up in the North" duly considering Strabo's geographical picture, should not be sought in the North, but in the Aral region,¹⁰⁴ thus just where Chinese sources place the Yen-ts'ai. From this it is clear that the Aorsians and Siracians had moved to South

⁹⁷ G. Haloun, ZDMG XCI (1937), pp. 246.

⁹⁸ Haloun, ZDMG XCI (1937), 246, and note 2, p. 251 and note 6; see also e. g. Herzfeld, AMI IV (1932), pp. 14 ff.

⁹⁹ *Saka Studien* pp. 98.

¹⁰⁰ The Greek form renders the Middle Persian plural *sakān* ~ *sagān* of the name Saka- (cf. e. g. *Sagānšāh* 'King of the Sacae'), or his form with the suffix -na-, *sakān* < *sakāna*- (cf. e. g. Ossetian *iron* 'Ost-Ossete, ost-ossetisch' side by side with *ir* 'Ost-Ossete').

¹⁰¹ ZDMG XCI (1937), pp. 249.

¹⁰² *Saka-Studien* 101.

¹⁰³ Fr. Hirth, *China and the Roman Orient*. Shanghai—Leipzig, 1885. p. 139, n. 1 and A. v. Gutschmid, *Geschichte Irans*. Tübingen, 1888. p. 69.

¹⁰⁴ See Junge, *Saka-Studien* pp. 54, 77 ff.

Russia from the Aral region. That their original abode was here is palpably proved by Ptolemaios, who following older tracks in his description of the peoples of Scythia intra Imaum (VI 14, 10), places the Aorsians, near to the Iaxartes—Syr-Darya. The intrusion of the Aorsians and of the Siracians into Eastern Europe was evidently the event which caused the "Royal" Sarmatians and the other Western Sarmatian tribes under the leadership of the former, to occupy the territory between the Danube and the Don and to consolidate their power there.

As we have seen this event was roughly between 130 and 125 B. C., in which time also the settling of the Aorsians and Siracians in Eastern Europe had to occur. Since the movement of the Sarmatian tribes extending from Lake Aral to the Danube, coincides in time with the Yüeh-chih inroad into Bactria, a close interrelation between the two events suggests itself. Thus it is highly probable that the formation of the great Sarmatian power between the Danube and the Don round about 125 B. C., may be brought into direct connection with the westward drive of the peoples' masses, due to the expansion of the Hsiung-nu empire. When the first Yüeh-chih move compelled large Eastern Saka masses to migrate, this event caused certain shifts also in the line of the Iaxartes—Syr-Darya, Lake Aral and the Caspian Sea, and in consequence of the pressure from the East gradually asserting itself, the power of the Sarmatians *i. e.* Saii holding the Dnieper region in their sway round about 145 B. C., weakened considerably. The decisive turn, however, occurred through the second Yüeh-chih move. Then one part of the Yen-ts'ai-Aorsians evidently strongly affected by the Yüeh-chih migration, together with other Iranian tribes, press westwards as far as the Don. The Sarmatian tribes, on the other hand, that had held this territory previously, took possession of the Dnieper region absorbing the Saii and formed with the other Iranian elements found there under "Royal" Sarmatian leadership an empire extending from the Danube to the Don.¹⁰⁵

9. The Sarmatian Phalerae and their Eastern Relations

It can also be ascertained from the available sporadic sources that the Western Sarmatian tribes had not always lived in loose formations and in chaotic disorder side by side, but brought about round 125 B. C. — after invading the territory between the Don and the Danube owing to the pressure of the Yüeh-chih expansion from the East —, a strong empire under the central leadership of a "royal" tribe which empire played for almost three quarters of a century an important historical role. Recognition of this fact permits the definition of the archaeological remains of the Western Sarmatians from this period. The Sarmatian finds from the Hellenistic epoch have a characteristic group with which Rostovtzeff dealt in several works.¹⁰⁶ The main characteristic of this group of finds is represented by golden or gilt silver horse trappings (phalerae) partly with representations of religious subjects, partly with plant ornamentation. Rostovtzeff included in this group the finds of Akhtanizovskaya Stanitsa, Severskaya Stanitsa, Yanchokrak, Starobel'sk, Taganrog, Uspenskaya Stanitsa, Novouzensk, Istetskaya Yurta and Galiche, as well as a phalera

¹⁰⁵ Hereby an old surmise of Müllenhof's won credit. See *Deutsche Altertumskunde. III.* Berlin, 1892, p. 41.

¹⁰⁶ *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, pp. 136. *Sarmatskiya i indoskifskiya drevnosti*. Recueil-Kondakov. Praga, 1926, pp. 239. *Skythien und der Bosporus. I.* 542, pp. 548, pp. 552, pp. 554, 583. See further A. Spicyn, *Falari yuzhnoy Rossii*: IIAK XXIX (1909) and N. Fettich: *Die Metallkunst der landnehmenden Ungarn*. AH XXI. Budapest, 1937. pp. 142.

from an unknown place of origin and two specimens of Pontic origin in the Cabinet des Médailles. Moreover he proved that the styles and manners of representation of these phalerae are in close connection with Graeco-Indian art.

According to Rostovtzeff the bearers of the phalerae were Sarmatian tribes that had been living in the past somewhere in the farther East in the vicinity of Indo-Scythians whence they had brought this style to South Russia. Here this art had no immediate precedent, the finds of Alexandropol and Fedulovo which alone might be taken into account from this point of view, belong to the beginning of the third century B. C., which means they are from a much earlier period than the above mentioned ones. However, the latter two also have links in common with Eastern and Graeco-Indian art, so that Rostovtzeff is inclined to attribute them to an earlier Sarmatian wave.

Two clues exist as to the chronological position of the mentioned group of finds. One is the find of Severskaya Stanitsa, which, in view of the coins of the last Pairisades found in it, must be placed in the last decade of the second century B. C. The other clue is offered by one of the plaques in the Cabinet des Médailles. Provided the inscription on it is no forgery, this may be regarded as originating from the period of Mithridates Eupator. As the finds belonging to the group are closely linked up by stylistic and topical concurrences, it is very probable that their place is between the time boundaries represented by the phalerae of the Cabinet des Médailles, and of the find of Severskaya Stanitsa, *i. e.* roughly between 110 and 60 B. C. The remaining question now is how this group of finds can be valued from the historical and ethnical points of view. As was seen, the group of finds spread over a territory extending from the Tobol to Bulgaria. This circumstance renders the solution extremely difficult. On this territory this time neither political, nor ethnical unity can be reckoned with, although this would be the most natural explanation of such a closely coherent find group within such a comparatively short interval. Thus it is no wonder that Rostovtzeff was also vague about this problem, in fact he eventually risked several conjectures partly at variance with one another.

As was mentioned, Rostovtzeff arrived at that undoubtedly correct result, according to which on the strength of the examination of the Sarmatian archaeological legacy, the immigration of the Sarmatians into South Russia happened in several waves. Hereby he obtained a historical frame into which he could place the group of the phalerae finds. A clue to this was the close connection of the phalerae with Graeco-Indian art, which could most easily be explained with the origin of the bearers of the phalerae in the vicinity of the Indo-Scythians. However, the piecing together of this seemingly concordant theory ultimately came up against various difficulties. As Rostovtzeff himself states, the main territory of the occurrence of the group of phalerae finds is after all confined to the Western part of South Russia and since a new art which may be called Irano-Celtic came about under its influence on the Celts, it can only be brought into connection with those Sarmatian tribes, who, according to him, first came into contact with Western peoples.¹⁰⁷ On this point it was extremely unfavourable that Rostovtzeff had no clear picture of Sarmatian migration. He did not reckon with the possibility that Sarmatian waves did not necessarily settle down one after the other from West to East in the order of their appearance, but that they could very well stratify one above the other and the later ones might have absorbed the earlier ones. Since he did not thought of this, for him the order of geographical location of the Sarmatian tribes was tantamount to the sequence of their historical

¹⁰⁷ *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, 139.

appearance, so that he held the Iazyges, who penetrated farthest West, to have been the first Sarmatian wave. This led to the result that he was compelled to consider the phalerae finds as the legacy of the westernmost Iazyges and Roxolani, who again in his opinion were the first Sarmatian wave in South Russia.¹⁰⁸

Needless to say, this theory was in sharp contradiction to the result he had reached, namely that the phalerae were bound to have been brought by a Sarmatian wave from the vicinity of the Indo-Scythians. The beginnings of the phalerae find group can only have been at the end of the second century B. C.; their bearers (thus those who brought them from the East) evidently cannot be identical with the earliest Sarmatian wave. Rostovtzeff himself may have felt this contradiction and tried to obviate it somehow. As he saw that the identification of Iazyges representing the first Sarmatian wave with the bearers of the phalerae, met with difficulties, he gave up this idea and merely stressed that the phalerae had to be brought by a newer Sarmatian wave from the East; but he refrained from giving a closer definition of the latter.¹⁰⁹

It goes without saying that this was not a reassuring solution, therefore Rostovtzeff came to the conclusion that the phalerae had been brought to South Russia by the Siracians and it is from them that they spread along the Northern Euxine coastline.¹¹⁰ This apparently puzzling change of opinion, after all is easy enough to explain: if the Iazyges who appeared earliest could not have brought the phalerae from the East, another tribe had to be found of which this could be more readily surmised, a tribe which arrived later and had a more eastern situation. Rostovtzeff found the Siracians the most suitable. However, these lived east of the Don on the steppes extending above the Caucasus, and not in the Western part of South Russia, whence the larger part of the phalerae finds originate and whence the influence of this group of find reached the Celts. Thus he was obliged to surmise that the Western Sarmatians had taken over the phalerae from the Siracians. This conception, however, partly contradicts that conjecture of his, according to which the Siracians had lived from as early as the end of the fourth century B. C. in their homeland north of the Caucasus, and he partly deprives his own theory on the origin of the phalerae of its foundation. It is obvious that, if the appearance of phalerae finds among the Western Sarmatians on whose territory their larger part had been found, are interpreted as having been borrowed from a Sarmatian tribe living farther east which handed them over, it is not necessary to consider the group of phalerae finds as a whole, as the legacy of a new Sarmatian tribe arriving from the immediate vicinity of the Indo-Scythians. Therefore all the efforts of Rostovtzeff levelled at the historical evaluation and the ethnic determination of the phalerae finds must be regarded as unacceptable owing to internal contradictions.¹¹¹

If we seek the causes which called forth the error of this eminent expert of Scythian and Sarmatian archaeological material, the following may be concluded: Rostovtzeff had no clear picture of that epoch of Pontic Sarmatian history to which the phalerae may be assigned and therefore he could not determine the historical framework of the material of finds, nor state its ethnic location. In addition to this, he unnecessarily linked up the problem of ethnic determination and the origin of the phalerae. First he asserted that the phalerae are linked by numerous common traits

¹⁰⁸ *Op. cit.* 145.

¹⁰⁹ *Sarmatskiya i indoskifskiya drevnosti* 256, 258, *Skythien und der Bosphoros I*, 604.

¹¹⁰ CAH XI, 102.

¹¹¹ The main cause of Rostovtzeff's statements being partly at variance with each other, is evidently that he could not work out his results in detail and cast them in a final form after his emigration.

to Graeco-Indian art and from this he immediately concluded that the phalerae were bound to have been brought from the vicinity of the Indo-Scythians by Sarmatian tribes migrating westwards from there. The correct procedure, on the other hand, is first to clarify the ethnic determination, or at least not to make this dependent upon the eastern relations of the representations and style of the phalerae, since these may not solely be explained by contiguity.

So much can, in any case, be stated that the chronological position of the phalerae finds fully tallies with the time of existence of the Western Sarmatian empire which stood out from our above results. The latter may be put round about 125 and 61 B. C. while the phalerae finds may be placed between 110 and 60 B. C. This concurrence no doubt proves that the phalerae finds are bound to be historically related to the Western Sarmatian tribal confederacy under "Royal" Sarmatian leadership. The total ethnical identification of the phalerae finds with the Western Sarmatian tribal confederacy is obviously contradicted by the fact that the area of occurrence of the phalerae finds extends from Bulgaria to Siberia, whereas the Western Sarmatian tribal confederacy held only the territory between the Danube and the Don in its sway. From this would follow that the phalerae finds have no ethnic determinative value, because the phalerae in a certain period were used by most Sarmatian and in fact by non-Sarmatian peoples (cf. the Noin-Ula phalerae).

Thus, if we hold that the appearance of phalerae in themselves do not constitute adequate ground for separating one Sarmatian tribe or tribal group from the other, we may, notwithstanding, not deny the possibility that within a phalerae find group here might occur such differences which might be utilized also for ethnic differentiation. Considering this we must stress the fact emphasized also by Rostovtzeff, that the major part of the phalerae finds originates from the western part of South Russia, that is, from the territory of the Western Sarmatian tribal confederacy. From this territory, in the south-easternmost corner of the Carpathian basin, in the department of Háromszék near Szörce, a more recent phalerae find came to light, which underlines the Western character of the phalerae find group even more. Investigating the Szörce find (consisting of two phalerae) Dr. N. Fettich arrived in this connection at the important result that the phalerae of Szörce, Galiche, and in addition the Taganrog, Yanchokrak and Starobel'sk finds are linked up by so many close congruences as far as subject, style and technique, that it is highly probable that they came from the same workshops.¹¹² This statement is important because in this way one group clearly stands apart from the others, namely the one whose area of occurrence is precisely the same as the one over which the empire under "Royal" Sarmatian domination extended. This means that we have succeeded in getting hold of the archaeological legacy of a Western Sarmatian tribal confederacy from the reign of Mithradates Eupator. It is surely no coincidence that only the works of one workshop or metal work centre spread just in this territory, but we might conclude that this territory at that time formed an economic and political unity. Apart from this such a largescale production of phalerae implies a certain economic boom, which again was possible only after the understanding reached by the Western Sarmatian power with Mithradates, when commercial relations could be established with the Pontic Greek cities.

Thus we may ascertain that the Western Sarmatian tribal confederacy under "Royal" Sarmatian leadership between 125 and 61 B. C., was a historical factor playing an important role in South Russia, which also made its influence clearly felt

¹¹² See *Folia Ethnographica* I/2 (1949) 135.

in the archaeological records. This is all the more obvious if we consider that certain finds, *e. g.* the Galiche one, can be evaluated historically even more accurately within comparatively narrow limits. Near Galiche a large Sarmatian find of 14 phalerae came to light. This locality, however, is south of the Danube, in Bulgaria, in the district of Orekhovo, where the cropping up of a Sarmatian find is conspicuous anyway, because this area had never been inhabited by Sarmatians. However, we have pointed out above that the Western Sarmatian power during the Mithridatic Wars intruded on the territory south of the Danube as well, and, in fact, according to the definite evidence of our sources, — just upon Triballian territory. Galiche lies roughly in the centre of what used to be Triballian territory, not too far from the Danube, so that there can hardly be any doubt that the phalerae find, which has come to light nearby, is a palpable record of the short-lived Sarmatian occupation of Triballian territory.

Thus it seems beyond doubt that one clearly isolated group of phalerae finds is to be regarded as the legacy of Sarmatian tribes belonging to the Western Sarmatian empire between 125 B. C. and 61 B. C. However, the question arises how the links of the phalerae with Graeco-Indian art as emphasized by Rostovtzeff, may be explained. As was seen above, only the eastern origin of the Aorsians in the course of the Yüeh-chih migrations is clearly traceable. The Sarmatian tribes between 130 and 125 B. C. occupying the territory between the Danube and the Don, had probably been living in Eastern Europe at that time, — namely in the decades immediately preceding this, — and were only driven from here by Aorsian pressure further west. So there is little likelihood from the historical point of view of the Sarmatian tribes bringing the phalerae directly from the vicinity of the Indo-Scythians. Against this stands the fact that we do not find the precedent of the phalerae find group confined to the territory of the Western Sarmatian empire farther east. It is true, on the other hand, that there are phalerae finds further east, as well, yet there is no clue whatever to these being older, moreover, they are so far removed from the Western group as regards style and technical characteristics that they cannot be derived from those. Thus, there is no other possibility than to consider this phalerae find group on the whole, as having originated in the West, and to link it up with the economic boom which was the consequence of the friendly relations established by Mithridates in the Pontic region with the Sarmatians.

By this we wish by no means to refute the eastern links of the phalerae so strongly stressed by Rostovtzeff. The fact that South Russia had very strong ties with India at this epoch should not be disregarded. This is proved not only by the phalerae in question but also by other archaeological finds. Thus, *e. g.* in Taxila the exact counterpart of the dagger of the Sarmatian find of Prokhorovka was unearthed.¹¹³ This lively trade linked India with South Russia across the Caucasus and Persia, which is recorded by the sources. Strabo mentions in his description of the Aorsians (XI 5, 8) that the latter conveyed on camels Indian and Babylonian merchandise which they took over from the Armenians and Medes. This report is important also because it states clearly that from India the trade crossing the Parthian empire did not only reach the Pontic empire but indirectly also the Sarmatians. Albeit Junge would like to interpret this report of Strabo as a Central Asiatic caravan route in a north easterly direction,¹¹⁴ but this forced explanation has no serious foundation. That Indian goods should have found their way to the Sarmatians on a trade route by passing the Caspian Sea from the north, in itself is feasible enough, but Strabo is explicit about the merchandise having been also Babylonian, moreover about the role of Armenians

¹¹³ See W. Ginters, *Das Schwert der Skythen und Sarmaten in Südrussland*. Berlin, 1928. p. 82.

¹¹⁴ Saka Studien 78.

and Medes as middlemen, so that there can be no question of misunderstanding.

Apart from this, Transcaucasian trade is clearly visible also from other sources. We know from another report of Strabo's (XI 2, 16) that in Transcaucasia on the Euxine coast the most important centre was Dioscurias. Strabo also mentioned that 70 neighbouring peoples came there to transact their business, among whom the Sarmatians are represented in the largest numbers. From this it can be clearly asserted that Sarmatian trade reached right down to Transcaucasia, where the merchandise from India could be taken over directly. In this connection the discovery of a burial ground near the Transcaucasian Bori (dept. of Kutais) on a territory belonging to the commercial sphere of Dioscurias, is of decisive significance. In this burial ground ornaments and precious metal objects came to light which show a close connection with the Taxila finds.¹¹⁵ In the same place also Roman, Parthian and Indo-Scythian coins were found which shows clearly that Indian trade must have crossed through this area. Taking all this into account we may further assume that the links of the Sarmatian phalerae with Indo-Scythian art may also have come about in this way, either by applying some Indo-Scythian motifs to Sarmatian phalerae, or by phalerae having found their way through trade from Indo-Scythia to Pontus where they were imitated. Such imported phalera or one which had been made at the influence of an imported one, might be the specimen in the Cabinet des Médailles from an unknown place, yet originating from the Pontic region; in the middle of it we find, an elephant represented.¹¹⁶

10. Conclusions

Summing up our results briefly, we may safely say, while challenging the generally current view according to which the Sarmatians were merely a loosely linked conglomerate of larger and smaller tribes living rather chaotically side by side, that the picture of a strong Sarmatian power existing for almost three quarters of a century round about the turn of the second and first centuries, stands out plainly even from the sporadic sources. The Sarmatian tribes bringing this about probably took final possession of the territory between the Dnieper and Danube round about 125 B. C. as a result of the peoples migration after the second Yüeh-chih move, and founded here a tribal confederacy disposing of expansive power under the leadership of their "royal" tribe. In the course of their expansion they soon made the Scythians their vassals and endeavoured to bring the Pontic Greek cities under their power. This challenged the interference of Mithridates Eupator, through which they were barred from the possession of the Greek cities, but in view of Mithridates' friendly policy they enjoyed the boons of favourable economic and trade relations and Mithridates' foreign political conceptions afforded them new expansive possibilities towards the west. Here they occupied the whole Lower Danube line, in fact they intruded on the territory south of the Danube and for a time they held one part of the Triballians.

We find the traces of this once important Sarmatian power during the Mithridatic wars also in the archaeological record material. When after the Pontic conquests of Mithridates the balance of power had been stabilized, more peaceful conditions were brought about and lively commercial relations were established between the Sarmatians and the Pontic region on the one hand and across Parthia between Pontus

¹¹⁵ See Rostovtzeff's arrangement; *Sarmatskiya i indoskifskiya drevnosti* 251. Concerning the Bori finds see E. Pridik, *MAR XXXIV* (1914), pp. 94.

¹¹⁶ See Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia* XXVII, 2.

and the Indo-Scythians on the other hand. Under the influence of Indo-Scythian art richly adorned horse trappings (phalerae) were being made in Pontus, perhaps also by the Sarmatians. It is just in the Western Sarmatian territory that we find one group of these characteristic trappings, most likely made in the selfsame metalwork centre, which is a clear proof of the economic and political unity of the territory under their power. Round the time of the death of Mithridates Eupator the strong Sarmatian tribal confederacy disintegrated and the "Royal" Sarmatians vanished from history. What may have been the reason cannot be clearly stated for the time being. However, later, after the consolidation of Roman power in the Balkans and the Pontic region such a strong Sarmatian power could not again spring up., so that we may indeed regard the epoch of the Sarmatian tribal confederacy existing between 125 B. C. and 61 B. C. as the most interesting period in Western Sarmatian history.

II. THE SARMATIANS IN HUNGARY

1. The Immigration into Hungary of the Iazyges

In the decades immediately preceding our era an advance of the Sarmatae towards the Danube estuary can again be observed.¹¹⁷ This is very likely connected with the break-up of the Dacián empire after the death of Boirebistas. The power of the Dacians having been broken, the way was open again to the Sarmatians across the Roumanian Lowlands towards the Danube. This time we hear about one of their tribes: the Iazyges.¹¹⁸ Ovid living in banishment in Tomi between the years 9 and 17 A. D., often complained of their raids.¹¹⁹ A few decades later we already find them in Hungary.¹²⁰ Concerning the route of the Iazyges on their way into Hungary, it has been suggested that they entered the country from Galicia passing through the mountain passes of the Carpathians.¹²¹ The distribution of the early Iazygian archaeological sites contradicts this assumption as it has been clearly proved by M. Párducz. No traces of Sarmatians have so far been found in Galicia or in the Carpathian Ruthenia. The northernmost of the early Sarmatian archaeological sites is the gold treasure found in the vicinity of Eger in Hungary. The number of sites increases as we proceed southwards, and reaches their highest density between the Danube and the Tisa and on the eastern banks of the middle course of the latter river; from these parts on the sites form a continuous chain and reach that stretch of the Danube which lies north of the Iron Gates.¹²²

This circumstance clearly shows that the Iazyges entered Hungary from the south through Oltenia and the Banat and not from the north through Galicia. This view receives a further confirmation by a circumstance that has so far not been considered. In his enumeration of the Sarmatian tribes (VII, 3, 18) Strabo passed from south to north and first mentioned the Iazyges, whose seats lay southernmost; to the north of these, between the Carpathians and the Dnieper, were the seats of the Royal Sarmatians and the Urgi. Ovid also mentioned the Iazyges as being settled along the lower reaches of the Danube, *i. e.* all through the Iazyges had kept southernmost of all the Sarmatian tribes. Thus the geographical distribution of the Iazyges

¹¹⁷ See: *Budapest története* (The History of Budapest), vol. I., p. 180.

¹¹⁸ Concerning the Iazyges and the Roxolani see the latest publication by K. F. Smirnov, in VDI. 1948, I, pp. 213 ff.

¹¹⁹ See: *Budapest története* (The History of Budapest), vol. I., p. 180. footnote 99.

¹²⁰ For the entry of the Iazyges into Hungary and the date of their arrival see: *Budapest története* (The History of Budapest), I, p., 181. For the literature on the subject see the same work footnote 101. on p. 181.

¹²¹ See C. Daicoviciu, *Apulum* I (1939—41) p. 15 and *Dacia* 7/8 (1941) p. 460.

¹²² See M. Párducz, *AE* 3 (1942) p. 315.

before their entry into Hungary, also confirms that they invaded Hungary from the south through Oltenia.

The entry of the Iazyges into Hungary and the problems connected therewith, were recently dealt with by Hungarian scientists. They attribute their settlement into Hungary to the Roman foreign policy that desired to set up a series of buffer states in front of their most dangerous enemies. The entry of the Iazyges had been permitted and even encouraged in order to form a bulwark against the Dacians, and it might even be assumed that the Iazyges were ordered by the Romans to settle down in the Danube-Tisa region.¹²³ The significance of the part played by Rome in the movement of the Iazyges into Hungary, cannot be denied but it is not unlikely that other forces must have contributed, too. We have seen further back that a number of Iranian waves followed each other migrating westwards across the South Russian steppes; each wave of newcomers pushed the earlier ones westward in front of them or else absorbed them completely. Such a newer wave set in with the arrival of the Alani into South Russia in the first decades A. D. ¹²⁴ For the time being this new wave had not passed beyond the river Don, yet the pressure it brought to bear upon the intervening tribes must have been felt by the Western Sarmatian tribes and by the Iazyges and Roxolani as well.¹²⁵ It is very likely that this pressure had played a part in the movement of the Iazyges into Hungary.

This view is further strengthened by the consideration that such a change of seats was far from being desirable for the Iazyges. As the results show, they were being hemmed in on one side by a well-defended Roman territory and on the other by warlike and inimical Dacians; there was left only a narrow corridor connecting them with the cognate Roxolani, a corridor that could at any time be cut off by the Dacians whose power was increasing; such an isolation did indeed take place in the days of Decebal. Due to these circumstances the Iazyges were forced into a precarious position with hardly any satisfactory way out. Added to this was the consequence that by moving into Hungary they had also lost their contacts with Pontic trade and economy though these contacts had been of vital importance to them.

These factors make themselves strongly felt in the archaeological remains of the Iazyges.¹²⁶ The archaeological remains of the Iazyges in Hungary from the first two centuries A. D., strike one at first sight as being rather poor in comparison to the Scythian and Sarmatian finds in South Russia. It is true, though, that the remains in Sarmatian graves from South Russia cannot be compared with the wealth of the Scythian Kurgan graves,¹²⁷ but even so the poverty of the Iazygian graves in Hungary remains a rather striking feature. Among the grave goods not only larger sized gold objects are lacking but also the usual equipments of the warrior as well. Opposed to the grave goods found in the Sarmatian graves in South Russia, this feature of the Sarmatian graves in Hungary needs an explanation.

The wealth of the Scythians in the heyday of their state, depended on their

¹²³ See: *Budapest története* (The History of Budapest), I. p. 181.

¹²⁴ For literature on the history of the Alani see J. Kulakovskiy, *Alani po svedeniyam klassicheskikh i vizantiyskikh pisateley*. Kiev, 1899. Ebert, *Südrussland im Altertum*, pp. 375 ff. Rostovtzev *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, pp. 116 ff. Junge, *Saka-Studien*, pp. 76 ff.

¹²⁵ See Rostovtzev in CAH XI p. 95.

¹²⁶ The archaeological remains of the Iazyges were examined by M. Párducz to whom we owe a reliable information on the point. The more important works of M. Párducz in this line are: *Die frühesten Funde der ersten pontisch-germanischen Denkmälergruppe in Ungarn*. Szeged, 1935. *Denkmäler der Sarmatenzeit Ungarns. I.* AH XXV, Budapest, 1941., *II.* AH XXVIII. Budapest, 1947. Laureae Aquincenses. *II.*, pp. 309 ff.

¹²⁷ For a general picture of the subject see Ebert, *Südrussland im Altertum*, p. 344.

trade with the Pontic Greeks. The Scythian state in South Russia was well-organised and created peaceful conditions to a certain extent. The agricultural production in these territories increased remarkably, and their produce found a way to Athens through the Greek towns along the Black Sea.¹²⁸ By the 4th century B. C. South Russia had become the granary of Athens. Wheat and other agricultural products were exported from South Russia through the Greek trading towns and correspondingly enormous amounts of Greek articles, precious metal objects, arms, pottery, etc., streamed into Scythia and reached even the innermost parts of her territory. The most important trading centre for the western part of Scythia was the Greek town Olbia.¹²⁹

The flourishing economic life of Scythia ended for ever and with it the wealth of the Pontic Greek towns, too, dwindled when the Scythian power was destroyed by the Iranian newcomers from the East.¹³⁰ The long wars prevented trade with the interior of the country and brought about a sharp decline in agriculture. We have seen from the Protogenes inscription what the position of Olbia, the most important trading centre of the Dnieper basin was like about the beginning of the 2nd century B. C. We see an impoverished town with its inhabitants living from day to day amid the constant threats of all kinds of barbarian tribes, interspersed with occasional sackings of the town; the inhabitants were embittered and were planning to leave the town altogether.

There are undoubted traces, however, that the town enjoyed once more an economic improvement for a short spell. In the 2nd century B. C. lively trade relations between Athens and the Pontic Greek towns seems to have been taken up once more. This was undoubtedly the result of the peace treaty concluded between the Pontic powers in 179 B. C. Among the parties to the treaty we find the Sarmatian king Gatalos. It was this peace treaty that to a certain extent had ensured a more peaceful state of affairs bringing about the revival of economic life and of trade relations.¹³¹ This event seems to hang together with the rise of the great Sarmatian confederacy that was founded in the 2nd century B. C. by a new wave of Iranian tribes coming from the East. This spell of peace and economic improvement had brought about the manufacturing and wide-spread use of the silver phalerae that were found in great numbers among the grave finds of the Sarmatians. It can hardly be doubted, therefore, that Olbia was playing an important part in this economic revival since she was the outstanding centre of trade with the Western Sarmatian tribes.

It has already been pointed out that the Sarmatian state came to an end between 75 and 61 B. C. Such an event could not have taken place without greater internal troubles and without affecting, in fact, even crippling economic life once more. A new blow was dealt to the Sarmatian tribes when the Dacians began to expand vigorously eastwards and to cut the Sarmatians off from the Greek coastal towns. Dacian expansion reached its climax when in the middle of the 1st century B. C. the Dacians destroyed Olbia.¹³² An attempt was to be made afterwards to rebuild the town but the new town was just a miserable shadow of the old one.¹³³

The destruction of Olbia must have come as a hard blow to the trade of the Western Sarmatian tribes. It is obvious that they became impoverished on account of

¹²⁸ For the latest publications on this problem see A. A. Yessen, *Grecheskaya kolonizatsiya severnogo Prichernomorya*. Leningrad, 1947 and a review of it by B. J. Nadel' in VDI 1948, 3, pp. 122.

¹²⁹ See Ebert, in RLV XIII, p. 94, Rostowcew, *Skythien und der Bosporus*, I, p. 404.

¹³⁰ Cf. Ebert, *Südrufland im Altertum*, p. 214.

¹³¹ This was noticed by Ebert, as well. Cf. his *Südrufland im Altertum*, pp. 215 f.

¹³² Ebert, *Südrufland im Altertum*, p. 225.

¹³³ Ebert, *Südrufland im Altertum*, p. 226.

the break-up of their confederacy, while the eastward expansion of the Dacians and the greatly perturbed conditions brought about a sharp fall in their economic life and trade. These Sarmatian tribes could never organize the economic production of the territories occupied by them in such a degree that they would have been able to export important quantities of agricultural products as the Scythians did. The import of goods, however, was a vital necessity to the Sarmatians since their territories were poor in manufactured goods and in metals. That is why it had become vitally important to them to levy a contribution on the agricultural population and the Greek towns — something similar was said by Strabo about the nomads of Crimea (VII 4, 6) — because it was only in this way possible to meet their requirements of imported goods. This expedient, however, did not much help them, since in the course of time the Pontic Greek towns and mainly Olbia had impoverished and the latter had been destroyed by the Dacians.

Keeping all these in mind we shall understand the significance of an information from the 2nd century. A. D. by Pausanias who paints a realistic picture of the poverty in which the Sarmatian tribes lived. The Sarmatians have no iron, we read, because iron is not mined with them nor can they rely on imports. From among all the barbarians in those parts, there is the least contact with them. They have bones for their spearheads, bows and arrows are made of sticks, and the arrowheads are also tipped with bones. In their encounters with the enemy they employ lassos and they cover their armour with scales chipped off hoofs. The description of this mail covered with horny scales suggests that the report by Pausanias refers to the Roxolani. If this was the state of affairs with the Roxolani who were still living in the sphere of interest of the Pontic Greek trade and who had remained relatively free, the conditions must have been much worse with the Iazyges who had really got into a tight corner by then.

The seats allotted to the Iazyges suggests that the tribe was a kind of a vanguard such as can be found in many of the nomadic tribal societies.¹³⁴ When they moved into Hungary, judging by the remains from their material culture, they might even have been poorer than such nomadic tribal vanguards usually were. In Hungary they first settled in the Great Hungarian Plain which best suited their nomadic system of breeding and small-scale agriculture,¹³⁵ but as this region was also poor in minerals, it did not supply them with precious metals, nor with iron needed for their arms and other equipment. Such staple necessities might have been procured if the Iazyges had organised production in their occupied territories for exports for it would not have been impossible to find markets. But the agriculture of the local population must have been on a low level to supply them with goods for trade, and, in addition, they were surrounded by enemies on all sides. The Romans could not be plundered with impunity like the Pontic Greek towns had been, though the Iazyges succeeded later on to extort stipends from their mighty neighbours.¹³⁶ We should not be surprised that the well-organised economic life and industry of the adjacent Roman province was a great temptation to them. And they did make use of the possibilities along this line. But neither their plundering raids, that were almost always followed by punitive expeditions, nor their economic contacts with the Romans, could have been sufficient to satisfy even to a smallest measure their most elementary necessities.

¹³⁴ For such organizations see J. Németh, *A honfoglaló magyarság kialakulása* (The Ethnogenesis of the Settling Hungarians). Budapest, 1930., pp. 19 f.

¹³⁵ For the agriculture of the Iazyges see: *Budapest története* (The history of Budapest), I., p. 178.

¹³⁶ According to recent investigations the Iazyges had received some kind of contribution from the Romans already at the very outset of their arrival in Hungary.

Their contacts with Pontic commerce and trade had also ceased especially after the Dacians had occupied the corridor connecting the Iazyges with the Roxolani.

They had to rely almost entirely on what they had brought along with themselves from their earlier seats such as small articles of precious metals made in the Pontic workshops,¹³⁷ and what they had found here in the occupied territories as the metal and pottery products of the indigenous Dacian and Celtic population.¹³⁸ It cannot surprise, therefore, if only such remains were found in their burying places. It is unlikely that they possessed iron arms but if they did, these must have been very valuable possessions that were passed on from one generation to the other and were never put into the graves. If they had at all put arms along with their dead, made of wood or bone, these would have decayed in the course of the many centuries. But is not unlikely that in this impoverished period of their tribal existence, arms were not included among the grave finds at all.

2. Iazyges and Roxolani

It is small wonder therefore, that the Iazyges were living in a ceaseless turmoil and unrest trying to widen the tight corner into which they had been pushed.¹³⁹ It was of vital importance to them from a political as well as economical point of view, to re-establish trade relations with the Roxolani and with the Pontic centres. It was, however, only in the days of Marcus Aurelius that after a long strife and after many unsuccessful attempts, they had succeeded in building-up these trade relations once more. The philosopher-emperor gave them leave to contact the Roxolani across the territory of Dacia.¹⁴⁰

The great importance of this contact of the Iazyges with the Roxolani and with Pontic commerce, can best be seen from archaeological evidence. The investigations of M. Párducz proved that the archaeological material of the Sarmatians in Hungary, may be taken to fall into several periods.¹⁴¹ Now it is an important fact that the second period set in at about the end of the 2nd century A. D., and that it differs from the first one chiefly that such metallic objects and types of beads were found which had otherwise been completely unknown among the finds in the Carpathian Basin. These are the so-called Sarmatian buckles, the short swords with ringed and cylindric hilts, various types of fibulae and cubo-octaëdric beads.¹⁴² Here the question at once arises as to where do these Sarmatian finds come from. There is no doubt about it that the peculiarly Sarmatian remains from the first period, derive from the Pontic workshops and that the Sarmatians had brought them along when they migrated into Hungary. In connection with the archaeological remains of the second period M. Párducz also suspects a Pontic origin based on positive and negative arguments. He succeeded in proving the Pontic origin of one part of the remains as in the case of the swords, double pendants, a certain type of buckle and the fibula with downward bent leg. As to the other part of the archaeological remains, he thinks a similar origin probable on the ground that nothing similar has

¹³⁷ For an analysis of the archaeological evidence see M. Párducz, *Denkmäler der Sarmatenzeit Ungarns, I.*, pp. 60 f.

¹³⁸ On Dacian and Celtic influences in the Sarmatian find see M. Párducz, *Denkmäler der Sarmatenzeit Ungarns, I.*, pp. 60 f.

¹³⁹ On the wars of the Iazyges see: *Budapest története* (The History of Budapest), I, pp. 188ff.

¹⁴⁰ Dio Cassius 71, 19, 1—2.

¹⁴¹ See his recent communication in *Laureae Aquincenses. II.*, pp. 320 f.

¹⁴² See Párducz, *Denkmäler der Sarmatenzeit Ungarns, II.*, pp. 74 ff.

ever been found in Hungary. It is worth while, therefore, to examine these latter finds in some detail.

As regards the cubo-octaëdric beads, it has been generally held, as M. Párducz had also thought in a previous paper,¹⁴³ that beads from semi-precious stones are of North Indian origin.¹⁴⁴ It seems that the Pontic Greek colonies had lively trade relations with Northern India in the Sarmatian period from the 3rd century B. C. onwards until the appearance of the Huns, and it may be surmised that the chief goods of exchange were these semi-precious stone beads. It is not unlikely that the Syr-Darya river served as a trade route for the traffic in beads, and it is probable that the river got its name Iaxartes (*Yaxšārt) on this account since Chinese and Turk translations call it the "Bead River". As to the eastern origin of the cubo-octaëdric beads in Hungary, it is proved directly by the fact that these beads are well-known in the archaeological finds from Chernyakhovo¹⁴⁵ and from Olbia.¹⁴⁶ It is obvious, therefore, that this type of beads reached the Sarmatians of Hungary through the Greek towns of the Black Sea.

It is equally easy to prove the eastern or more correctly Pontic origin of the Sarmatian buckles, too. M. Párducz himself pointed out that a characteristic type of buckle, *viz.* the buckle with cross-shaped pin, has an exact parallel in a find from Kertsh.¹⁴⁷ He also showed that some exact parallels to the double pendants used on belts, were found in the graves of Koshibeyev and Kuzminsk.¹⁴⁸ The number of parallel finds may easily be increased. A similar buckle with cross-shaped pin was found further east in Permian near Trandī.¹⁴⁹ Another type of buckle seems to have been also wide-spread, *i. e.* large buckles sometimes round, sometimes slightly oval-shaped without a strap fastening metal strip. Similar buckles were also found in the East, *e. g.* in the archaeological remains from Atamanovī Kosti.¹⁵⁰ We know also oblong buckles without strap fastening metal strips in the archaeological finds of Sarmatian origin in Hungary and similar ones in the finds from Olbia.¹⁵¹ The two last types appear in another shape as well with a short strap fastening metal strip. A semi-circular type was found among others in Olbia,¹⁵² a square one in the kourgans of Mishkina Pristan at the Volga.¹⁵³ The most typical form of the Sarmatian buckles from Hungary, are small, semi-circular or square ones with long connecting metal strips.¹⁵⁴ A buckle similar to these was found in the graves of Atamanovī Kosti in Russia.¹⁵⁵ We have to mention one more peculiarly Sarmatian buckle where the pin is surrounded on both sides by an ornament in the shape of two semi-circles. Such pelta-shaped buckle was found in the archaeological remains from Ernőháza,¹⁵⁶

¹⁴³ *Denkmäler der Sarmatenzeit Ungarns, I.*, p. 71.

¹⁴⁴ See among others J. Strzygowski, *Altai-Iran und Völkerwanderung*. Leipzig, 1916., p. 276.

¹⁴⁵ See Ebert, RLV XIII.

¹⁴⁶ See B. Posta, *Archeologische Studien auf russischem Boden*. Budapest—Leipzig, 450, 251., drawing 2.

¹⁴⁷ *Denkmäler der Sarmatenzeit Ungarns, II.*, p. 77.

¹⁴⁸ *Denkmäler der Sarmatenzeit Ungarns, I.*, p. 74.

¹⁴⁹ See A. V. Schmidt, ESA 1 (1927) 31, figure 13.

¹⁵⁰ See Schmidt, ESA 1 (1927) 39, figure 27.

¹⁵¹ B. Posta, *Archeologische Studien auf russischem Boden*, 390 drawing 226.

¹⁵² B. Posta, *Archeologische Studien auf russischem Boden*, 421 drawing 242.

¹⁵³ Schmidt, ESA 1 (1927) 37, figure 19.

¹⁵⁴ See recently M. Párducz on this subject, *Ant. Hung.* 1 (1947), pp. 50 ff.

¹⁵⁵ Schmidt, ESA, 1 (1927) 39 figure 29.

¹⁵⁶ M. Párducz, *AE* 1 (1940) XLIII., Plate 14.

¹⁵⁷ M. Párducz, *Denkmäler der Sarmatenzeit Ungarns, I.* Plate III. figure 2.

¹⁵⁸ K. Szabó, *FA* 1/2 (1939) II., Plate I.

Csongrád,¹⁵⁷ and Orgovány.¹⁵⁸ The chalcedonic buckle found at Monor may be classed to this type in spite of its slight variation.¹⁵⁹ An exact replica of this type of buckle can be seen in the Museum of Odessa from Olbia or Kertsh¹⁶⁰ and another one was found recently among the Sarmatian grave finds excavated in the vicinity of the "Stepan Razin" kolkhoz (Distr. Davidov, Gov. Voronezh).¹⁶¹

There can be no doubt, therefore, that the cubo-octaëdric beads together with the various types of Sarmatian buckles, swords with ringed and cylindric hilts and the fibula with downward bent leg, are of Pontic origin in the Sarmatian archaeological material from Hungary. Since in the Sarmatian archaeological material of Hungary from earlier periods we can find no traces of these elements, and on the other hand the chalcedonic beads and the ceramics closely connect the archaeological material of the first and the second Sarmatian periods, we are not justified to assume an ethnical change, the sudden revival of a rather active trade with the Pontic Greek towns seems to be a more likely explanation.

Searching for the historical factors causing this process, it is essential to delimit chronologically the first and the second periods. M. Párducz had not succeeded for some time to produce an entirely clear and definite result,¹⁶² but recently working on the exact chronological delimitation of the various Sarmatian periods he came to the conclusion that the central part of the second period must be put between 200 and 270 A. D.¹⁶³

On a closer examination we shall find that the most practical way to establish the date when the second period set in, is to consider the fresh archaeological material from the Black Sea, the more so because this will, first of all, help to establish the main character of the finds. If this is so we can accept the conclusions of M. Párducz on the dates of some of the archaeological material, and might place the beginning of the second period indeed somewhere about 200 A. D. and the end somewhere later about 280—300 A. D. Now if we consider that these pieces had been in use for some twenty years at least before the burial, then we might put the date of this energetic revival of trade with the Pontic region somewhere between 180 and 260 A. D.

As we can see, the beginning of the second period and the revival of Pontic trade, falls together with the time when Marcus Aurelius admitted the Iazyges to a free passage over Dacia to the Roxolani. Thus it seems established that the most important factor in the Sarmatians' material culture as presented by the archaeological evidence from the second period, was first of all the renewed contact of the Iazyges with the Black Sea region.

It seems likely that the end of the second period, the break-off in the trade with the Pontic region, may also be connected with some important historical event. In the Pontic trade with the Dnieper basin the chief part was played by Olbia and Tyras. We have already noted that among the Sarmatian archaeological remains from Hungary of this period, there were several pieces of Pontic origin that have their next parallels in the finds from Olbia. This evidently shows that Olbia was one of the chief centres for the trade with the Iazyges. But the movement of the Goths was a heavy blow to the trade along the Black Sea, and when in 260 A. D. Tyras and

¹⁵⁹ M. Párducz, *Denkmäler der Sarmatenzeit Ungarns*, I., XXIII. 20.

¹⁶⁰ B. Posta, *Archeologische Studien auf russischem Boden*, 433, 244. figure 4.

¹⁶¹ A. Smirnov, VDI 1940 3/4 364, Fig. 3.

¹⁶² See *Denkmäler der Sarmatenzeit Ungarns*, II., pp. 82 ff and Laureac Aquincenses. II. 321.

¹⁶³ *Denkmäler der Sarmatenzeit Ungarns*, III.

Olbia was captured by them,¹⁶⁴ it must have put an end to all trade connections of the Iazyges with the Pontic regions. This date agrees again with the conclusions drawn from archaeological evidence which shows that trade relations ceased once more with the Pontic Greek colonies.

3. Goths and Roxolani

It is very important to observe that in the archaeological material which showed such a marked change in the Iazygean civilization of the second period, there were present such elements that take us back not only to the vicinity of the Black Sea but even further east as far as the Volga basin. If the first place we refer to the swords with ringed and cylindric hilts and to the cubo-octaëdric beads which were found in the Alanian tombs of the Volga basin.¹⁶⁵ This bears on our argument in so far as it shows that during the 1st and 2nd centuries A. D. some shifting of the peoples took again place in South Russia. On the evidence of a number of classical sources it has been generally believed by scholars that the Alani slowly migrated towards the West during the 1st and 2nd centuries A. D., and that in the time of Marcus Aurelius they had arrived as far as the lower Danube.¹⁶⁶

But this belief rests on an error. The statements of those classical geographical sources which put the Alani west to the Don, were based on a simple cartographical mistake, whereas the historical sources that placed the Alani to the same territory, were a pseudo-historical reflection of later ages.¹⁶⁷ But there is another way to deal with the problem as to how the Alani settled down in South Russia, which have been neglected so far. The Greek cities in South Russia became Iranian to a great degree during the first centuries A. D.¹⁶⁸ In the course of this process members of different Iranian tribes migrated into the Greek cities in such great numbers that hundreds of inscriptions remained along the coast of the Black Sea to preserve their names.¹⁶⁹ Obviously this enormous number of names is comparatively the safest evidence to establish the presence of Alanian ethnic elements. We are well-informed of the differences that distinguish Alanian language from the languages of other Iranian peoples;¹⁷⁰ hence there is no peculiar difficulty to pick out the Alanian names. If we examine the inscriptions from this angle, then we shall find that we can trace a great number of Alanian elements in the Pontic towns lying east of the Don and in the Crimea, but not a single one in the Greek cities on the north-western coast of the Black Sea. It is not very likely, therefore, that the Alani should have reached the Danube in the 2nd century A. D. It might, of course, have happened that they exten-

¹⁶⁴ See on the subject Ebert, *Südrussland im Altertum*, 228 p. 376.

¹⁶⁵ See Ebert, *RLV XII* 106, 108.

¹⁶⁶ See among others Ebert, *Südrussland im Altertum*, p. 376.

¹⁶⁷ A good example of the latter case can be seen in connection with Maximinus I, whom the biased Herodianus made out to be a semi-barbarian of Thracian origin, and adding to this the *Historia Augusta* took him to have been of Gothic-Alanian extraction.

¹⁶⁸ Ebert, *Südrussland im Altertum*, pp. 343 f; Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, pp. 144., 167 ff.

¹⁶⁹ These inscriptions were collected and published by B. Latyshev *Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini Graecae et Latinae*. Petropoli I. 1885, II. 1890. IV. 1901. The investigations concerning the Iranian names of the inscriptions were summarised by Vasmer, *Die Iranier in Südrussland*, pp. 23 ff.

¹⁷⁰ See Ws. Miller, *Osetinskiye etyudi III*. Moskva 1887, p. 82f., *Die Sprache der Osseten*, Straßburg 1903. 7; Vasmer, *Die Iranier in Südrussland*, p. 28 f.

ded their power west of the Don, probably even as far as the river Donets, but in the western parts of South Russia we cannot reckon with them as having been one of the ethnic elements.

This implies some important consequences. First of all, it eliminates that widespread belief that the Roxolani had been absorbed by the Alani¹⁷¹ and leaves the Roxolani as important factors in history even as late as the 2nd and 3rd centuries A. D. In the 2nd century A. D. or rather at the end of it, the Goths arrived in South Russia and conquered the territories that had formerly been the seats of the Roxolani. The Goths in South Russia stood under a strong Iranian influence that affected almost all sections of their civilization.¹⁷² This influence has so far been attributed to the Alani, partly in the belief that the Goths had already found the Alani on the spot, and partly based on the fact that in the age of the Huns the Goths often appeared together with the Alani.¹⁷³ But as we have already pointed it out, in those days there were no Alani settled west of the Don, where the Goths must have found the Roxolani, and therefore the Iranian influence on the Goths was mainly due to the Roxolani.

4. The Disappearance of the Roxolani

At this point the historical events, hitherto relatively easy to follow, begin to get confused. Thus if we take the Roxolani as an important factor in South Russia, how are we to account for their sudden disappearance in the 3rd century? Formerly it used to be maintained that they had been absorbed by the Alani¹⁷⁴, while those who did not accept this view, believed that the Goths had crushed and assimilated them.¹⁷⁵ We have already pointed out the improbability of the first assumption, but the latter one is hardly more tenable. If we follow closely the fate of the nations connected with the Goths, we shall find absorption or coalescence had never taken place, not even in the case of much smaller nations than the Roxolani such as the Skiri, the Bastarnae or the Carpi were. It seems by all means certain that the Goths pushed them out from their original seats around the Dnieper and squeezed them into the Roumanian Plain. Yet the question still remains open what happened to them later on.

At the same time as the Roxolani vanished from the scene, other events, hardly less unaccountable, took place with the Iazyges settled in Hungary. The Iazyges caused a considerable stir during the 3rd century¹⁷⁶ but we are at a loss to explain the vigorous activity they displayed during the time of the Tetrarchy. The emperors themselves had to lead during their twenty years seven campaigns against them¹⁷⁷ and in the meantime they had to settle them in great numbers on Roman territory.¹⁷⁸ What was it that had strengthened the forces of the Iazyges to that extent? Later on, under the rule of Constantine, internal disturbances broke out among them, and by the orders

¹⁷¹ Rostovtzeff, *CaH* XI. 95, 97; F. Altheim, *Die Krise der alten Welt. I.* Berlin—Dahlem, 1943. 97.

¹⁷² See Altheim, *Die Krise der alten Welt*, pp. 98 ff.

¹⁷³ See Altheim, *Die Krise der alten Welt*, op. cit., pp. 97, 104 ff.

¹⁷⁴ See among others Rostovtsev and Altheim mentioned in footnote 171.

¹⁷⁵ *Bibl. Pann.* VI. 276; J. Harmatta, *Das Volk der Sadagaren.* Kőrösi-Csoma Emlékkönyv. Budapest, 1942. p. 27.

¹⁷⁶ About the wars of the Iazyges in the 3rd century see: *Budapest története* (The History of Budapest), I., 670.

¹⁷⁷ See: *Budapest története* (The History of Budapest), I., 675.

¹⁷⁸ Orosius, VII. 25. 12.

of emperor again great numbers of them were settled in Roman provinces, according to the sources about 300,000.¹⁷⁹ We can only realize fully the meaning of these numbers, if we consider that the number of the Hungarians entering this country, were estimated to have amounted to not more than 200,000.¹⁸⁰ In spite of such large-scale settlements the Iazyges, already called by the name Sarmatae, still kept on besieging the Roman frontiers with the same force during Constantine and Valentinian.¹⁸¹ It is hardly possible that the Iazyges not too numerous when they came to Hungary should have multiplied and grown in strength to such an extent while they were having one destructive war after another.

It would be obvious that this increase of the Iazyges took place by the addition of new ethnical elements and, in fact, there are certain traces that seem to strengthen this view. A part of the Sarmatian names preserved by Ammianus Marcellinus, show such phonetic peculiarities which differ from former Iazygian names and point to a different Iranian language. There occur among these names already some typically East Germanic names, too which testified that for sometimes already the Sarmatae have intermingled with the East Germans. Ammianus described the Iazyges (XVII 12, 2.) as wearing armour made of chipped scales of bones, a type of armour not worn by the Iazyges¹⁸² but which was, as we have seen, a typical armour of the Roxolani¹⁸³.

Similar problems present themselves in the archaeological material as well.¹⁸⁴ M. Párducz proved that at the end of the 3rd century a new period shows in the archaeological remains of the Sarmatians in Hungary,¹⁸⁵ with two different groups discernible from this time on. One group is represented by burial places with barrows, the other is represented by an absence of any burial mounds. There is more than one reason for supposing that the civilization of the latter type of burials, developed from the Sarmatian civilization of the second period under the influence of the small-mound graves. On the other hand, the new rite of burial and the mass of the discovered things which point to the Black Sea and the Roumanian Plain, witness that the archaeological material of the third Sarmatian period points to the appearance of a new people.¹⁸⁶ It is worth while to note that among the grave finds there appeared the long sword,¹⁸⁷ which had not yet been known to the Iazyges,¹⁸⁸ but which, as we know from a description of Tacitus (Hist. I. 79), was a typical weapon of the Roxolani. It is equally important that in the archaeological remains there appeared a large number of traces bearing Germanic influence, but in all probability the influence not of the Hungarian Vandals but of East Germanic tribes, Goths or Taifals.¹⁸⁹

¹⁷⁹ Exc. Val. 32.

¹⁸⁰ See recently: *A magyarság őstörténete*. (The Prehistory of the Hungarians). Editor L. Ligeti. Budapest, 1943. 125.

¹⁸¹ See about these wars *Budapest története* (The History of Budapest), I., pp. 679 ff.

¹⁸² See *Budapest története* (The History of Budapest), I. 177.

¹⁸³ Tacitus, Hist. I. 79.

¹⁸⁴ We discovered this problem with Mihály Párducz and solved it together. Later Aladár Radnóti also added interesting observations in Roman provincial archaeology and numismatics. We gave an account of our results at a meeting of the Régészeti és Művészettörténeti Társulat (Society for Archaeology and the History of Arts) giving a joint lecture on 26th October, 1946.

¹⁸⁵ Laureae Aquincenses, op. cit., II. pp. 321 ff.

¹⁸⁶ Párducz already thought of that possibility and dealt with it in some detail, See M. Párducz, Laureae Aquincenses. II., p. 325.

¹⁸⁷ See M. Párducz, AÉ 2 (1941) pp. 111 ff. Laureae Aquincenses, II. p. 322 f.

¹⁸⁸ In the Sarmatian second period we have come across only of short swords. See M. Párducz, *Denkmäler der Sarmatenzeit Ungarns*. II., II. 77 ff.; *Budapest története* (The History of Budapest). I. 177.

¹⁸⁹ See M. Párducz, Laureae Aquincenses, II. p. 324.

The importance of this fact will only be clear if we consider that among the Sarmatian names of Ammianus, we can find typically Eastern Germanic names, too. Archaeological evidence points to the assumption that the barrow people had already been intermixing for some time with Eastern Germans.

These historical and archaeological data present the following two problems. The Goths pushed the Roxolani out of their seats at the Black Sea and squeezed them into the Roumanian Plain. This event must have gone on for some time and could not have taken place without the two nations influencing each other deeply. The Goths had adopted numerous Iranian cultural elements and obviously absorbed several ethnic features of the Roxolani as well. We might presume similarly that a great cultural and ethnic influence had been exerted by the Goths on the Roxolani. At the time when the Goths led their great attack, the Roxolani had completely vanished from the scene, while history can still trace the rest of the small nations crushed by the Goths, such as *e. g.* the Bastarnae, the Carpi and others, after this event. The question is, therefore, where and why did the Roxolani vanish.

On the other hand, at the same period such an activity and such an increase in the population, can be observed to have taken place with the Sarmatians of Hungary that is easiest explained by assuming the arrival of newcomers. This assumption is corroborated by a new set of Sarmatian names appearing in the work of Ammianus. In addition Ammianus gave such a description of the Sarmatians of Hungary that does not fit the Iazyges, but is very like the picture we have formed about the Roxolani from other sources. The names known by Ammianus will convince us as well that these Sarmatians had for some time contacts with East Germans and had intermingled with them. Archaeology presents a new ethnic element, too, in the new rite of burial and in the numerical increase of the finds almost to the double number.¹⁹⁰

Among the archaeological remains we come across a long, claymore like sword which indicates the Roxolani, but other recovered articles clearly show that the newcomers had been intermingled with Eastern Germanic ethnic elements.

5. The Immigration into Hungary of the Roxolani

The two problems helped to solve each other. As the Roxolani had vanished at a time when the new Iranian element appeared in Hungary, we must necessarily conclude that these two events were in some way connected with each other. The Roxolani under the pressure of the Goths, arrived through Oltenia and Dacia into Hungary at a time when the great Gothic attack was beginning against the Roman Limes on the lower Danube.

This assumption solves the whole string of the problems mentioned above. We get an explanation for the disappearance of the Roxolani, and we understand as well why the sources of the following ages keep silent about them. Contrary to the other peoples who were driven by the Goths before them, the Roxolani did not settle on Roman territory but came to that part of Hungary which had been occupied by the Iazyges. We must not forget either that during the 1st and 2nd centuries A. D. the strongest desire of the Iazyges and the Roxolani seemed to have been to contact each other. In this — as we have seen — they have succeeded under Marcus Aurelius

¹⁹⁰ According to the statistics of the Sarmatian archaeological finds in Hungary the finds are distinguished according to different periods: first period: 30 finds, second period: 50 finds and third period: 105 finds. Kind information by M. Párducz.

and the essential changes in the Iazygian archaeological material witness to the intensity of the Iazyges—Roxolani relations. It must have been obvious to the Roxolani, when they were driven on by the Goths, to seek shelter in the seats of the related Iazyges and not on Roman territory in Moesia. This accounts for the fact why contemporary historical sources never mention the Roxolani any more. The sources dealt with contemporary events only from the Roman point of view, and thus they mention only those peoples who, fleeing from the Goths, took their way towards Roman territory, or such as were to be settled on Roman territory, as was the case with the Bastarnae. The Roxolani joined the Iazyges and from that time on they went together by the name Sarmatae.

This makes it clear why the Iazyges got so suddenly strong in arms as well as in number, and why they displayed such remarkable activity from the last quarter of the 3rd century on. Very likely these Roxolani settlers, coming in great numbers, pushed the Iazyges out of their seats, and since by all probability they were a stronger and a more numerous tribe, they took the power into their own hands and changed the material culture of the Iazyges.

This will solve the problem of the archaeological remains as well. The custom of barrow burial was brought in by the Roxolani, and the flat graves were those of the Iazyges, the two tribes living side by side. But the Iazyges soon took over the material culture of the Roxolani, and from them on the grave finds found in the flat graves do not materially differ from those found in the barrows. If we assume that the Roxolani, who had had contacts with Eastern Germanic peoples and had been intermixing with them, settled in Hungary, then we can understand why we find names of Germanic origin among the Sarmatian names mentioned by Ammianus, and further on why we find such a strong Germanic influence in their archaeological remains. It becomes clear as well why Ammianus, writing of the armour of the Sarmatians in Hungary, really gave a description of the Roxolani when he wrote of scale-armoured warriors.

We need not be surprised that Ammianus did not know about the Roxolani in Hungary and simply used the name Sarmatae when referring to them. It is true, though, that Roman history in the 1st and 2nd century A. D. applied the name of Sarmatae generally to the Iazyges and never to the Roxolani. But by the 4th century A. D., in the age of Ammianus, the name Roxolani had completely ceased to be used in the current language of the day. Nor was the name of Iazyges any more in use. The conglomerate of Iranian peoples living in a turmoil in Hungary, was simply referred to as Sarmatae to tell them apart from the Alani who by this time had also arrived there.

That Ammianus was mistaken as far as the names Iazyges and Roxolani were concerned, is clearly shown when he took these peoples as still being settled along the northern shores of the Black Sea following therein his earlier sources.¹⁹¹ This is more than a deliberate attempt at being archaic. Similar mis-statements can be found in other periods of classical geography. When the Sarmatians had destroyed the Scythian kingdom, many centuries after the event our sources keep on mentioning the Scythians and other peoples as still being settled in the Pontic regions as they used to do in the days of Hecataeus and Herodotus.¹⁹² The chief cause of this mis-statement was that for a long time no information had been available to throw light on the new situation with its confused ethnic developments. Something similar got again

¹⁹¹ Cf. Ammianus XXII. 8, 31.

¹⁹² See J. Harmatta, *Quellenstudien zu den Skythika des Herodot*, pp. 6 f.

repeated in the 3rd and 4th centuries A. D. when this time the Sarmatians were driven away from around the Black Sea. Ptolemy was the last to undertake a great geographical synopsis in classical literature; no similar attempt was made after him in order to present a geographical picture on a large scale that would have given a clear picture of the new state of things. So Ammianus had to avail himself of what there had been ready at hand, and there was nothing else to rely on but Ptolemy.¹⁹³ That he should pick out of Ptolemy's work just the Iazyges as a Sarmatian people as being still settled in the Pontic regions, shows in itself how completely forgotten the name Iazyges had been by then though formerly, in the 1st and 2nd centuries, it was used as a synonym for Sarmatian. In the days of Ammianus new barbarian names were known in connection with the Sarmatians such as the Limigantes and Ardaragantes.¹⁹⁴

6. The Evacuation of Dacia and the Roxolani

We can see, therefore, that a series of problems of the 3rd century A. D., solve themselves when we admit that the Roxolani, being driven by the Goths, settled in Hungary. It remains to be decided when and how that was possible.

If we examine the historical events, we shall find that the first great blows Dacia received, were inflicted upon her under Philippus and Traianus Decius.¹⁹⁵ According to our sources Dacia was ravaged by the Carpi, while the invasion of the Goths was directed rather against Lower Moesia.¹⁹⁶ We shall best understand what a terrible blow this was to Dacia, if we consider that from that time on nearly no Roman coins at all were found in that country.¹⁹⁷ It seems rather obvious that the Roxolani must have moved into Hungary during this unsettled period.

It is not at all difficult to find some traces of this event. Though the invasion of the Carpi was mainly directed against Transylvania, while the Goths broke into Lower Moesia, yet the territory of Oltenia did not remain intact either. Under the emperors Philippus and Traianus Decius the chain of front-line fortifications were lost in the east of the Olt, and it was at this time that the Romans withdrew their occupying forces behind the Olt limes.¹⁹⁸ In view of all this we may assume that this province was also visited by invasions. As it is not very likely that these invasions were in any way connected with either the Carpi or the Goths, it seems much more probable that they hung together with the earliest arrival of the Roxolani on Hungarian territory. That such an invasion was not impossible through the Oltenian-Banatian narrow Roman corridor, is proved by the fact that even in Moesia permanent raids and invasions of the barbarians were the order of the day, so that fortifications had to be built against them far in the interior of the province as is attested by the inscription of Kutlovica dating to 256 A. D.¹⁹⁹ It is not very likely, however, that the entire people of the Roxolani had reached Hungary during these few years. Other tribes such as the Carpi also reached Roman territories only in several waves.²⁰⁰

¹⁹³ See as to relation of Ptolemy and Ammianus Th. Mommsen, *Hermes* 16 (1881); O. Cuntz, *Die Geographie des Ptolemaios*, Berlin, 1923. 39.

¹⁹⁴ Hieronymus, *Chron.* a. 2350.

¹⁹⁵ See EPhK 54 (1930), 2.

¹⁹⁶ Schmidt, *Die Ostgermanen*, 207; EPhK 53 (1929) 163. That the Gothic raids were not directed against Dacia, see EPhK 54 (1930) 92.

¹⁹⁷ See EPhK 54 (1930) 3. and *Magyarok és románok* (Hungarians and Roumanians) I. Budapest, 1943. 70.

¹⁹⁸ *Magyarok és románok* (Hungarians and Roumanians), I. 70.

¹⁹⁹ See EPhK 54 (1930) 90.

²⁰⁰ See Schmidt, *Die Ostgermanen*, 221, 224.

It is highly probable, therefore, that the Roxolani reached Hungary not in one body but that they arrived in various groups. Very probably this infiltration and settling down in small numbers, came to an end only after Dacia had been completely given up, and thus there were no more obstacles in the Roxolani's way. We might infer that this movement towards Hungary, beginning under Traianus Decius, was stopped for some time by the consolidation under Gallienus.²⁰¹ Though it is true that the bulk of the army, stationed in Transylvania, was withdrawn under Gallienus,²⁰² yet on the other hand, the country between the Danube and the Timișul was under a stronger military occupation than ever before.²⁰³ The reason of this interesting military reshuffle was performed, according to recent research, in order to leave a route open in case of any threatening invasion and to isolate from Moesia those barbarians that had been settled by Gallienus obviously in the east or north-east of Dacia to guard the frontiers. On the other hand, taking into account that Dacia had not been entirely given up as yet, and that military troops and state administration had been left behind in some places, we might as well suppose that the chief reason for this strong military occupation of the corridor connecting Dacia with the Empire was to guard the contact between the province and the other Roman territory. That such military measures were necessary is shown by the fact that the contact had been for some time in considerable danger. Very likely this danger was due to the Roxolani.

Which route might namely the Roxolani have taken? If we consider all the possible traffic lines in use in those days, then it will be clear to us that the most likely route taken was through the Iron Gate, Mehadia, the Porta Orientalis and through the valley of the Timișul, a route that has been much favoured ever since classical time.²⁰⁴ It is very interesting to note in this context that the southern part of this road was guarded by two units under Gallienus: the cohorts III Dalmatarum between Mehadia and Plugova and a detachment of the legio XIII Gemina at Băile-Herculane.²⁰⁵ It is hardly probable that these troops were guarding the road between Dierna and Sarmisegethusa at this particular spot since from a strategic point of view it could hardly be imagined to hold up an attack from the north or east by guarding the last stretches of the road. Such a disposition of the troops could have been effective only when the idea was to secure the road between Dierna and Sarmisegethusa, from an attack that was expected from the south. It is equally unlikely that these troops had been placed here to intercept an attack against Moesia from the east or north-east. It is hardly conceivable either that the enemy could traverse over the Godeanul or the Retezat as both mountains are over 2000 metres high. An attack coming from the Transylvanian Basin was possible only through the Iron Gate pass and the Bistra valley. Had these Roman forces been kept there to defend against such an attack, they ought to have been stationed somewhere about Caransebeș. From a strategic point of view it seems more likely that these units were meant to secure the connections between Rome and Dacia against an attack expected from Oltenia. The task of these troops was very likely to guard the road leading from Oltenia through the valley of the Timișul to the Hungarian Plain in order to prevent the Roxolani from breaking through the Dacian corridor and cutting the communications between Rome and her province already partly evacuated.

²⁰¹ See on this subject *Magyarok és románok* (Hungarians and Roumanians) 73.

²⁰² EPhK 54 (1930) p. 8, 11 f.

²⁰³ See EPhK 54 (1930) 10.

²⁰⁴ See about this road C. Patsch, *Der Kampf um den Donauraum unter Domitian und Trajan*. SWAW 217 (1937) I. Abh. 108.

²⁰⁵ See EPhK 54 (1930) 12; Schmidt, *Die Ostgermanen*. 211.

It is very possible that all attempts at an invasion by the Roxolani must have been stopped for a time by the military reforms of Gallienus and the consolidation following it, as well by closing down the military road from Oltenia to the Hungarian Plain by stationing troops there.

An episode from the life of Regalianus, a rival of Gallienus, has hitherto been neglected and not fully understood; this episode will help to prove that a part of the Roxolani had already been settled in Hungary. Regalianus after defeating Ingenius was proclaimed emperor by his troops in 260 A. D., according to one information in Moesia and according to another at the initiative of the Moesians.²⁰⁶ Recent investigations resulted in proving that the legions taking part in the revolt of Regalianus were the X and XIV Gemina from Upper Pannonia, the XIII Gemina of Dacia, and the XI Claudia legion from lower Moesia.²⁰⁷ It looks rather probable that the information of both sources meant not more than that Regalianus was proclaimed emperor on the initiative of the Moesian legion. The proclamation must have taken place somewhere in Pannonia since the defeat of Ingenius took place in the same province, probably near Mursa or Sirmium, where all the rebellious troops must have been concentrated.²⁰⁸ The power of Regalianus could hardly have spread as far as Moesia since his coins have not been found outside Pannonia.²⁰⁹ According to our informations during his short reign Regalianus had to fight against the Sarmatians, but at the instigations of the Roxolani a conspiracy by his own soldiers put an end to his life.²¹⁰ According to the usage of the time the name Sarmatians here means Iazyges and therefore the fight against them also connects Regalianus to Pannonia once more. But what does it mean that the Roxolani took part in the plot against Regalianus? This information makes no sense, if we assumed that the Roxolani were settled on the Roumanian Plain near Lower Moesia, since Regalianus could not have visited this province during his short reign. Everything will be clear at once, if we assume that some of the Roxolani had already been settled in Hungary. It might have been they who were responsible for the Sarmatian disturbance which Regalianus had to quell, and this again was an important factor since it led to his final destruction.

The defeat of Regalianus seems to point to the presence of the Roxolani in Hungary and this needs not be doubted. Another information in the *Historia Augusta*, cleared up only lately, tells that Regalianus was proclaimed by the Moesians; this information has also been interpreted to prove that it was the Claudia legion of Moesia that took part in the revolt leading to the proclamation of Regalianus.²¹¹ Now if the *Historia Augusta* gave evidence that was for once exceptionally reliable about the beginning of Regalianus' reign, then we might trust that the story of his fall might equally be true.

7. The Fall of the Sarmatians in Hungary

The Romans left Dacia for good under Aurelianus after which the way was open to the Roxolani. The effect of their arrival must have been felt soon. According

²⁰⁶ Epitome de Caesaribus 32, 3; Script. Hist. Aug. trig. tyr. 9. On the revolt of Regalianus see Stein, RE II. R. I. Bd. pp. 462 ff.

²⁰⁷ See NK 25 (1926) p. 71 f.

²⁰⁸ See Stein, RE II. R. I. Bd. 462.

²⁰⁹ See Stein, RE II. R. I. Bd. p. 462. The explanations given by B. Saria, Klio, 30 (1937), pp. 352 ff., do not materially alter this fact.

²¹⁰ Script. Hist. Aug. Trig. Tyr. 9.

²¹¹ See NK 25 (1926) 72.

to our sources the Sarmatians soon became a standing danger already under Carus, and they threatened not only the Illyricum, but even Thracia and Italy²¹². Historical investigation has not appreciated this fact at its full merit, because the historical connections behind it were not seen. We cannot even accuse our source of rhetorical exaggeration since the threat of the Sarmatians increased in the following years. Two punitive expeditions were led by Diocletian himself against the Sarmatians in 286 and 293. At the same time a number of fortifications were being built along the Danube under the personal supervision of Diocletian. He took a special interest in the setting up of a bridgehead at Dunaszekcső, and he also caused the rebuilding of the extensive fortifications on the two wings of the Sarmatian front at Bononia and Transaquincum. After these preparations the great attack was launched against the Sarmatians led by Maximianus in person.²¹³

We have excellent documents on the great importance attached to these Sarmatian wars. It was at this time that the Tetrarchy began to mint new silver coins, and this was used to commemorate the victory won over the Sarmatians.²¹⁴ These coins bore witness to the great importance the Romans paid to the defeat of the Sarmatians, implying even that it was the outstanding event of the times because no other victory had ever been celebrated in this way, neither the ones won over the Goths, Bastarnae, Carpi nor those over the Quads or the Marcomanni. This proves that the Sarmatians had been a much greater danger than any of the other peoples.²¹⁵ It seems, therefore, rather likely that the bridgehead at Dunaszekcső was set up more against the Sarmatians than against the Goths.

The wars led by the Emperors themselves against the Iazyges continued during the Tetrarchy. Small wonder that historians in the past found it "surprising" that during Diocletian's reign seven military expeditions had to be led against the Sarmatians and yet no reason could be given why this should have happened. The unparalleled exertions of the Romans against the Sarmatians were rather remarkable in an age when no similar strenuous efforts were needed against any nation, not even against the Goths. It seems as if the pressure on the Roman Empire put on by the Sarmatians, was greater than that by any other nation during those decades. This circumstance may be accounted for by assuming that the entire people of the Roxolani had been settled in Hungary by then.

Historical evidence shows that after his victory, Diocletian settled great masses of the Sarmatians on Roman territory. These Sarmatian masses, at least a part of them, were probably Iazyges since it was at about this time that the second of the Sarmatian archaeological periods ended. Future archaeological investigations will have to decide on this question, but in the meantime we want to call attention to one interesting archaeological find which is by all probability in connection with the departure of the Iazyges. In the vicinity of Szil (County of Somogy) that is to say, in the former province of Pannonia, a sword with a ringed hilt was discovered, and we know that this was a characteristic piece of the archaeological goods from the second Sarmatian period.²¹⁶ It is probably no mistake on our part to bring this archaeological evidence into relation with the settlement of the Iazyges on Roman territory during the reign of Diocletian. This evidence proves, too, that the Sarmatians, admitted to Roman territory, that is to say, Iazyges were the bearers of the 2nd Sarmatian period.

²¹² Script. Hist. Aug. Car. Num. et Carin. 9.

²¹³ See *Budapest története* (The History of Budapest), I. 673.

²¹⁴ See *Budapest története* (The History of Budapest), I. 674.

²¹⁵ See, *Budapest története* (The History of Budapest), loc. cit.

²¹⁶ On the sword of Szil see M. Párducz, *Denkmäler der Sarmatenzeit Ungarns*. II. 79.

The departure of such great masses of the Iazyges eased the internal strain with the remaining Sarmatians considerably. The Iazyges remaining in their former seats, intermixed freely with the Roxolani. It is likely that the cemeteries of the third period with their flat graves belonged to their descendants whose grave finds are not different from those found in the tumuli. The fact that from this time on the flat graves and tumuli appear side by side,²¹⁷ points to the assumption that an end had been put to the independent power of the Iazyges.

In view of the above interpretation we will find it only too natural that in the following years the pressure of the Sarmatians on the Roman Limes, was considerably lessened.²¹⁸ But great disturbances break out again among them when the Goths attacked the country. Though Constantine hurried to their aid and defeated the Goths, nevertheless great masses of Sarmatians, according to one information a population of 300,000, were forced to leave the Hungarian Plain and settled on Roman territory. This great disturbance, according to our informations, was caused by a Sarmatian civil war. When the Goths attacked the Sarmatians, the latter armed their servants, who thereupon revolted and drove their masters away.²¹⁹ Information being very scanty we do not know whether this civil war was waged along social lines or was prompted by tribal hatred. Nor can we ascertain what part the differences in the social position between the Iazyges and the Roxolani, played in this outbreak. Nevertheless, it is most likely that the internal strife was a tribal war waged between tribes, and if it was that, then this event also suggests that the tribal organization of the Roxolani, unable to withstand the strain, got broken up.

It is likely that the Sarmatians, settling on Roman territory at that period, were mostly or even entirely Roxolani. We have an interesting information on this point. During the reign of Julianus, hardly thirty-one years after Constantine had such masses of Sarmatians transferred, there appeared a small Iranian people along the lower Danube under the name of Sadagarii.²²⁰ Later on Jordanes mentioned this small tribe, too, and from him we get the information that they were living in Little Scythia. Now the best possibility for an Iranian tribe to get settled in this place during the 4th century was the great re-settlement of the Sarmatians by Constantine. And our sources do, in fact, tell us that a part of the Sarmatians were settled in Scythia. Therefore, it is surely possible that the people of the Sadagarii was transferred from Hungary to Little Scythia in the course of the Constantine re-settlements. Now the name of Sadagarii means: "(the people) of the hundred hills". It seems obvious for us to assume a connection with the custom of the burial in tumuli since such a grave-yard looks very much like a hilly country with hundreds and hundreds of hills. If such a connection had really existed, and we have no reason to doubt it, then in the Sadagarii we can see the bearers of the barrow grave culture by way of historical evidence, too. We might, therefore, regard as possible that the Sarmatians, resettled by Constantine, must have mostly or entirely been Roxolani.

The Sarmatians, left behind in Hungary, were scattered during the great turmoil caused by the appearance of the Huns. We can follow the fate of some of these surviving fragments even through the following centuries. Yet a new chapter begins here in the history of the migration that was spreading for over two thousand years.

²¹⁷ See on this subject M. Párducz, *Denkmäler der Sarmatenzeit Ungarns, III*. [Add. note: p. 215 foll.]

²¹⁸ See, *Budapest története* (The History of Budapest), I., 676.

²¹⁹ Eusebius, *Vita Const*, 4, 6; Ammianus XVII 12, 18.

²²⁰ On the following see J. Harmatta, *Das Volk der Sadagaren*, pp. 17 ff.

III. THE LANGUAGE OF THE SARMATIANS

1. A History of the Problem

After Müllenhoff's fruitful activity¹ it was Miller's investigations² that produced a great advance in the research on the language of the Iranian tribes in South Russia. The ancient inscriptions of the Pontic region were collected and edited by Latyshev,³ so that the fairly large number of names appearing in the inscriptions has become easily accessible to linguists. Miller had made a thorough study of Ossetian, a language still spoken in the Caucasus, and on the basis of his expert knowledge of that tongue, he began to investigate the material of names appearing in the ancient inscriptions of South Russia. His work was crowned with success: with the help of Ossetian, he managed to find out the meaning of a considerable portion of the non-Greek names in the inscriptions. The phonemic form of the names thus interpreted by Miller shows, in many cases, a phonemic development parallel with that of Ossetian. These correspondences may be summed up as follows:

1. The initial phoneme *p-* of the Old Iranian languages has a corresponding *f* both in the names figuring in the inscriptions and in Ossetian: *e. g.* Φίδας = Ossetian *fidä* 'Vater' ~ Avestan *pitā*; Φούρας = Ossetian *furi* 'Sohn' ~ Avestan *puθra-*, etc.

2. The Old Iranian initial group of phonemes *fri-* developed into *li-*: Λείμανος = Ossetian *limän* 'Freund' ~ Old Iranian **friyamanah-*.

3. Old Iranian initial *v-* has disappeared before *i*; 'Ινσάζαγος = Old Ossetian **insadz-ag*, cp. Western Ossetian *insäi*, Eastern Ossetian *ssäj* 'zwanzig' ~ Avestan *visaiti*.

4. Old Iranian initial *h-* has disappeared before *a*: 'Αβδ- (in the following word: 'Αρδάβδα < *Αβδ-άρδα) = Ossetian *avd* 'sieben' ~ Avestan *hapta-*.

5. Instead of Old Iranian *r* we find *l* before *i*: see above Λείμανος and also Φαλδάρανος, in which Φαλ- = Ossetian *fäl-* ~ Avestan *pairi*.

6. The Old Iranian initial group of phonemes *ary-* developed into *ir-*: 'Ηρακῆς = Ossetian *ir* 'Ossete', *iron* 'ossetisch' ~ Avestan *airya-*.

7. In place of the Old Iranian group of phonemes *ti* we find the groups *ts* or *dz*: 'Ινσάζαγος = Old Ossetian **insadz* ~ Avestan *visai-ti*.

8. The Old Iranian group of phonemes *-θr-* is replaced by *-rθ-* or *-rt-*: Φούρας

¹ *Deutsche Altertumskunde*, III. 101—125.

² His chief works: Осетинские этюды, I—III. Москва 1881—7; Дигорские сказания, Москва 1902; *Die Sprache der Osseten*, Strassburg 1903; *Ossetica*, Москва 1904; the Ossetian dictionary published posthumously by Freimann: Осетинско-русско-немецкий словарь, I—III. Ленинград 1927—34.

³ *Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini graecae et latinae*, I. II., IV. 1885—1901.

= Ossetian *furt* 'Sohn' ~ Avestan *puθra-*; -ξαρθος in names like *Καινάξαρθος* etc. = Ossetian *āxsart* 'Macht' ~ Avestan *χšaθra-*.

9. The Old Iranian group of phonemes -χr- developed into -rχ-: *Σόρχακος* = Ossetian *surχ* 'rot' ~ Avestan *suxra-*.

10. The numerous names ending in -ακος, -αγος appearing in the inscriptions, correspond exactly to the present active participles formed in Ossetian with the ending -äg: e. g. *Γώσακος* = Ossetian *iγosag* 'gut hörend, guter Hörer', from the verb *γos-un* 'hören'; *Κάσαγος* = Ossetian *käsag* 'guter Seher' from the verb *käs-un* 'sehen, schauen'. (In this case we come up against an obvious error of Miller's, since the words *iγosag* and *käsag* contain, not the ending -äg mentioned above, but the suffix -ag, -agä which is used to form adjectives expressing permanent qualities from the present stem. The forms of names appearing in the inscriptions may, of course, just as well stand for adjectives formed with the suffix -ag as for participles formed with the ending -äg).

11. The suffix -γηνος, found in some of the names in the inscriptions, corresponds exactly to the suffix -gin which forms adjectives in Ossetian: *Νάμγηνος* = Ossetian *nom-gin* 'namhaft, berühmt'.⁴

On the basis of these correspondences Miller came to the following conclusions:

1. The Ossetes belong to the Iranian group of the Indo-European family of languages.
2. The ancestor of the Ossetian language was one of those dialects which had developed in the northern part of the territory once inhabited by the Iranians, i. e. on the steppes of Central Asia, lying roughly to the north of the rivers Oxus and Yaxartes.
3. The separation of this dialect from the common Iranian parent language had taken place in prehistoric times, before the cultured nations of Iran — the Medes and Persians — entered the course of their historical existence.
4. The ancestors of the Ossetes belonged to those nomadic Iranian peoples who, for many centuries, were known partly as Sarmatians and partly as Scythians, and who occupied the steppes stretching along the Pontus and the Sea of Azov.⁵

From this formulation of Miller's it does not appear clearly whether, in his opinion, the dialect, which he regards as the ancestor of the Ossetian language, was the common dialect of the Scythian—Sarmatian tribes, or a separate Ossetian dialect quite apart from the tongue of the Scythian—Sarmatian tribes. From Miller's other remarks, about the position of the Ossetian language, it appears, however, that on the whole he regards the Scythians and Sarmatians as the ancestors of the Ossetes and that, in his view, the language of the Pontic Iranians (Scythians and Sarmatians) must be identified with Old Ossetian, i. e. an earlier stage in the development of the Ossetian language.⁶

After Miller, it was Vasmer who dealt in some detail with the language of the Iranian tribes in South Russia,⁷ in a much more cautious manner. This caution is especially noticeable when he discusses the mutual relationship of the available Scythian and Sarmatian names. Vasmer has attempted to separate, on the basis of the available material of names, the language of the Scythians, from that of the

⁴ See Миллер, Осетинские этюды, III, 83, *Die Sprache der Osseten*, 6 foll. With regard to par. 6 see Vasmer, *Die Iranier in Südrussland*, 28.

⁵ Осетинские этюды, III, 100 foll. and also 73.

⁶ See e. g. Осетинские этюды, III, 101: ...пути которым следовали предки осетин (сармато-скифские племена)...; *Die Sprache der Osseten*, 7: „Diese Eigentümlichkeiten der pontischen iranischen Sprache gestatten uns, in derselben eine Verstufung der Ossetischen zu sehen, welche als ein Nachkomme der ausgestorbenen 'Sarmatischen' gelten kann". See also *ibid.* 4, 5.

⁷ *Untersuchungen über die ältesten Wohnsitze der Slaven. I. Die Iranier in Südrussland*, Leipzig 1923, *Iranisches aus Südrussland: Streitberg-Festschrift* 367—376, and also *RLV XII*, 236—251.

Sarmatians. But he has no doubts, either, as to the close connection existing between Sarmatian-Alanic, on the one hand, and the Ossetian language, on the other.⁸ His formula admits of a wide range of possibilities.

Vasmer's caution was undoubtedly well-founded since, though it is possible that ethnically the Ossetes are the descendants of an Iranian tribe in South Russia, it is hardly likely that a strikingly large number of Iranian tribes from South Russia, appearing in different places and under different names in the course of history, could be gathered into a single unit. Neither is it likely that their language could be regarded as Old Ossetian, *i. e.* as an earlier stage of the present Ossetian language. Vasmer's attempt to separate the language of the Scythians from that of the Sarmatians was not very favourably received. The negative attitude to Vasmer's theory found its clearest expression in Lommel's criticism. The latter admits the possibility of linguistic differences between Scythians and Sarmatians but, according to his view, these must have been quite insignificant. Against the differences which, in his opinion, cannot even be demonstrated, Lommel emphasizes those linguistic peculiarities of Scytho-Sarmatian which closely connect this latter group of languages with Ossetian and Sogdian. Such is the use of the *-t* as the plural suffix in all these languages (Scythian—Sarmatian—Alanic *-tai*, Ossetian *-tā*, *-t'ā*, Sogdian *-t*). In Lommel's view this way of forming the plural may date from very early times, and may have spread very long ago over the whole linguistic area of Northern Iran. Thus in Lommel's conception the picture of different Northern Iranian languages or dialects is replaced by a homogeneous Northern Iranian linguistic community or linguistic area.⁹

The idea of a Northern Iranian linguistic group that forms the background of Lommel's arguments took definite shape only after the important archaeological discoveries in Eastern Turkestan had brought the Sogdian language to light. It was at this time that, following Andreas' hints, Gauthiot formulated his theory, according to which Sogdian, Chorasmian, Alanic, and Ossetian, together with the rest of the related languages, formed a common "Scythian" group of languages.¹⁰ Gauthiot's theory found, on the whole, general acceptance. One of the most prominent common features of this "Scythian" group of languages is the formation of the plural with *-t*, already referred to above¹¹; after Tomaschek¹², Marquart¹³, Lommel, Jacobsohn¹⁴ and some other scholars it was Kretschmer who recently tried to prove the existence of this feature, on the basis of a more detailed argumentation from the Scythian language, with the plea that its presence in Yagnobi, Sogdian, and Ossetian argued for its extreme antiquity.¹⁵

The basis of all these conjectures and arguments is formed, whether consciously or unconsciously, by the old theory of the family-tree of languages. According to this theory, the Aryan branch, having become independent of the primitive Indo-European linguistic community, was only gradually divided into Indian and Iranian, Iranian in

⁸ *Die Iranier in Südrussland*, 28 foll.

⁹ See *AfsI Ph* XL (1926), 151 foll.

¹⁰ *Essai de grammaire sogdienne*, Vol. I, Paris 1914—1923, III.

¹¹ See Benveniste, *Essai de grammaire sogdienne*, Vol. II. Paris 1929. 79.

¹² *SWAW* CXVII (1888), 47.

¹³ *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran*, II, Leipzig 1905, 78 foll.

¹⁴ *KZ* LIV (1962), 268.

¹⁵ *Glotta* XXIV (1936), 42. — The ending *-tai* in Scythian-Sarmatian tribal names was first compared by Miller with the Ossetian plural sign *-tā*. Vasmer was the only scholar to reject this explanation (*Iranisches aus Südrussland: Streitberg-Festgabe*, Leipzig 1924, 373 foll.) but his arguments were found unconvincing by all scholars, including H. W. Bailey (*Asica*, reprinted from *TrPSH* (1945), 25 foll.). Nevertheless, the question requires fresh, more detailed examination.

its turn being subdivided later into the Northern (or "Scythian"), Southern, Western, etc. branches. Anyone imbued with the spirit of this theory would naturally attribute the common features in different languages to an ancient unitary linguistic community; the farther he travels back on the road leading from individual languages, to the original linguistic community, the less inclined he becomes to assume the existence of linguistic or dialectal differences in the languages of human communities. This explains why Miller tried to establish the following line of development: Scythian—Sarmatian—Alanic—Ossetian, why Lommel thought it unlikely that there were any tangible dialectal differences within the North Iranian or "Scythian" branch, why the plural formation with *-t* was attributed to such an early date. Seen from the angle of the family-tree theory, the linguistic facts could be best explained by assuming the former existence of a "Scythian" branch speaking a uniform language, and developing, through a slow process of differentiation, into languages like Ossetian and Yagnobi, still spoken to-day. Starting from the premises of such a theory one naturally could not assume the existence of any noticeable dialectal differences in the various groups of Scythian and Sarmatian, since these languages represented an earlier stage in linguistic development.

The limitations imposed by the family-tree theory upon research may be best observed in Vasmer's case. He already noticed that in the material of names figuring in the inscriptions there are forms bearing witness to different lines of phonemic development. In some instances, when the forms were obviously synchronous and differences could not be explained as being due to temporal succession, he actually thought of these differences concealing some dialectal variety. In most cases, however, he did not reach this conclusion, but either disregarded facts testifying to the existence of dialectal differences, or tried to assign such forms to a later date¹⁶.

A similar theory also underlies Sköld's researches into the Ossetian loanwords in Hungarian, and the related problem of Ossetian dialects. Sköld tried to prove that the Ossetian loan-words in Hungarian derive, not from an extinct Alanic or Ossetian dialect, but from Eastern Ossetian which is still a living language. In his view the Ossetes and the Alans formed a single people who once used to inhabit a large territory. Nevertheless, he thought it impossible to assume the existence of other Ossetian dialects at an early date, apart from those two which are still spoken. Thus in Sköld's theory, too, we are clearly faced with the idea that we cannot assume a greater linguistic differentiation than that prevailing at the moment¹⁷.

Sköld's conception is based on the mechanical and forced application of a theory: it is best shown by his disregarding the fact that even present-day Ossetian has more than two dialects. Already Miller noticed three Ossetian dialects (Western, Eastern, and Southern Ossetian)¹⁸. Recently Abaev's investigations have clearly demonstrated that in the Southern Ossetian territory alone there are three separate dialects, easily distinguishable by their phonemic characteristics.¹⁹ If Sköld had no doubts with regard to the existence of the eastern and western Ossetian dialects as early as the age of linguistic connections between Ossetes and Hungarians, he naturally could have no reason to doubt the existence of other Ossetian dialects in the same period. So he simply paid no attention to the southern Ossetian dialect or dialects which contradicted his theory.

¹⁶ *Iranisches aus Südrussland*, 370.

¹⁷ ZII III (1925), 179 foll., *Die ossetischen Lehnwörter im Ungarischen*. Lund—Leipzig 1925, 66 foll.

¹⁸ *Die Sprache der Osseten*, 2.

¹⁹ О языке южных осетин. Языки Сев. Кавказа и Дагестана. 87 foll.

Thus it is entirely natural that Sköld's conclusions about the Ossetian loan-words in Hungarian, and the relations between Alans and Ossetes in general, have been recently thoroughly revised by Abaev. Abaev refuses to view the problem of Alanic—Ossetian contacts as a problem of racial and anthropological relations, he regards the Alans simply as “forebears”, the Ossetes as “descendants”, as Miller had done. In his view, the question of Alans and Ossetes is significant only as the “problem of cultural-historical and linguistic contacts between two peoples of the Northern Caucasus, one of them living at the present time, the other in the Middle Ages.”²⁰

Abaev has sought to throw light on the relations between Alans and Ossetes from several directions. He examines, first of all, the place-names in the territory inhabited by the Balkars and the Karachay, and discovers numerous Ossetian elements in them; on the basis of these elements he comes to the conclusion that the territory was once inhabited by people who spoke Ossetian, or, more precisely, the western dialect of that language. He points out, on the other hand, that, according to the testimony of medieval sources, the Balkar and Karachay territories used to be inhabited by Alans, and that as a matter of fact, the Karachay are to this day called *alan* by the Mingrels. These facts, in Abaev's view, can be explained only by supposing that historical contacts between Alans and Mingrels must have existed during the Middle Ages. The inscription of Zelenchuk, found at a site north of the present Karachay territory, is regarded as being Ossetian by Abaev who, on this point, follows Miller's view. Abaev also discusses in detail linguistic contacts between Hungarians and Ossetes. He has no doubts that there is a *stratum* in the Hungarian and the Ossetian vocabulary common to both languages, this leads him to the conclusion that at a definite historical period there must have been two contiguous linguistic communities; the descendants of one of these communities are the Hungarians of to-day, the descendants of one of these communities are the Hungarians of to-day, the descendants of the other are the present Ossetes. Thus, taking the historical continuity of Alans and Ossetes as his basis, Abaev thinks that the people who enriched Hungarian with Ossetian elements, could only have been the Alans. He tries to illumine the problem of historical contacts between Alans and Ossetes, also by examining Alanic person's names. Abaev points out that the Alanic name *Ma-ta-rh-sha*, known to us from a Chinese record, has an exact equivalent in the present Ossetian name *Matärsa*, while the name *A-da-chi* has a corresponding Alanic form *Addac* in the fifth century. Finally, Abaev discusses in detail the interpretation and significance of the Alanic formulae of salutation preserved in Tzetzes, from the angle of Alanic—Ossetian relations. He demonstrates that the Alanic words found in Tzetzes show close affinity to present Digorian (Western Ossetian) forms. Nevertheless, in summing up the results of his investigations, Abaev expresses his conviction that “a great many of those peculiarities, which nowadays separate the Ironian (= Eastern Ossetian) dialect from the Digorian, did not exist at that time (in the eighth century), and the (linguistic) facts established by Tzetzes reflect, not some specific “Digorian” forms, but the “average” Alanic forms of that age.”²¹

Abaev's work has, in many details, greatly contributed to research intended to clarify relations between Alans and Ossetes. But on the whole, Abaev's point of view is closely related to Miller's attitude which he had rejected so sharply, in principle. The fact is that Abaev denies the existence of the present dialects in medieval Ossetian, *i. e.* regards Alanic as a uniform language, and admits the theory of a direct

²⁰ *Alanica*. ИАН СССР 1935, Отд. общ. наук, 881 foll.

²¹ With regard to Abaev's conclusions see also D. Gerhardt's detailed review, amounting practically to a translation, in *ZDMG* XCIII (1939), 33 foll.

Alanic—Ossetian historical continuity: these features of his attitude are hardly influenced by the circumstance that he does not regard the Alans simply as the “forebears” of the Ossetes, nor the Ossetes as the “descendants” of the Alans. Abaev’s whole view rests fundamentally on the family-tree theory, as did that of Miller: in accordance with this basic conviction Abaev would derive the Ossetian dialects of to-day from a uniform medieval Alanic language. This view reflects, no doubt, the conviction that if we reverse the flow of time, we meet with increasingly uniform states of language. It is enough to give two examples, in order to show to what extent this conception influences Abaev’s work. In analysing the Alanic word $\chi\alpha\varsigma$, he is only anxious to stress that the word stands nearer to the Digorian form $\chi warz$ than to the Ironian form χorz . In Abaev’s opinion, it is usually the Digorian dialect that represents the older phonemic stage; consequently, if the phonemic form of the Alanic word is closer to the Digorian form, this would prove clearly, on the one hand, that there is direct historical connection between Alanic and Ossetian, and, on the other, that the Ironian phonemic form must have been, formerly, the same. Meanwhile, Abaev fails to notice that it is impossible to deduce the present Digorian and Ironian forms from Alanic $\chi\alpha\varsigma$ (c: χas , $\chi a\check{s}$, χaz , etc.), so that this word, instead of lending support to, actually refutes the theory of direct historical connections between Alans and Ossetes. Similarly, in connection with the Alanic word $\chi\sigma\iota\nu\alpha$ the only thing Abaev notices is the presence of the final phoneme -a which appears also in the Digorian form $\check{a}\chi sin\check{a}$ (in contrast to Ironian χsin). In this case both the Digorian and the Ironian forms may be derived, without any special difficulty, from Alanic $\chi\sigma\iota\nu\alpha$: but the Hungarian word *asszony* (Old Hungarian *achscin*, c: $a\chi sin$), borrowed from Alanic before the tenth century, definitely points to a form, $a\chi sin$. It follows from this that, as early as the tenth century, two forms, $a\chi sin$ and $\chi sina$, must have been in living use, i. e. the present dialectal differences in Ossetian must have already existed then.²²

In contrast to Miller’s view, according to whom Alanic-Ossetian was in direct historical connection with the language of the Scythians and Sarmatians, Andreas had previously expounded his theory that the Alans were not Sarmatians, but later immigrants into Southern Russia from their Eastern Iranian home in Xwārizm.²³ Andreas’ arguments, unfortunately, did not appear in print, so that his conception had no serious response for a long time. Meanwhile Charpentier, too, started advocating the theory of the Eastern descent of Alans and Ossetes, deriving his arguments from historical sources. He conjectured that the original tribal name of the Alans was *as-* or *os-*, so that the Alans may be regarded as being identical with the *Ἀσίοι* who, according to Strabo, had conquered Bactria, with the *Asiani* of Trogus Pompeius, and the *Wu-sun* of Chinese sources.²⁴ Charpentier’s conclusions would have had, of course, far-reaching linguistic consequences if only they could have been verified. But the necessary linguistic material was missing at the time. The eastern linguistic contacts of Alanic—Ossetian could be tackled, with any hope of success, only after Chorasmian texts had come to light in considerable quantities, i. e. when it became possible to form some idea of the language of Xwārizm, the territory from which Andreas had long ago sought to derive the Alans and Ossetes.

²² Abaev’s latest book: *Осетинский язык и фольклор*. Т. I. Изд. АН СССР М.—Л. 1949, has so far been inaccessible to me.

²³ See A. Christensen, *Die Iranier: Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*. III, Abt. I. Teil, III, Bd. III. Abschn. 1. Lief. München 1933, 249, note 2. Andreas himself gave a brief outline of his position in *Verhandl. d. XIII. Intern. Orientalisten-Kongresses*. Leiden 1904. 103.

²⁴ *ZDMG* LXXI (1917), 357 foll. Of the tribes identified by Charpentier we have to exclude, in any case, the Wu-sun, for historical and geographical reasons; see G. Haloun, *ZDMG* XCI (1937), 252.

It was Zeki Validi who first succeeded in discovering Chorasmian texts in any quantity, and who found a passage in Birūnī (in the Introduction to the *Tahdīd nihāyāt al-amākin*) which seems to be of decisive importance in forming a judgment about the language of the Alans. According to Validi, the passage in Birūnī informs us that the "Alans and Ās had formerly lived, together with the Pechenegs, around the lower reaches of the Amu-Darya (the Uzboy), and later, after the river had changed its course, they migrated to the coast of the Sea of the Khazars"; Birūnī also tells us that "the language of these Alans is a compound of Chorasmian and Pecheneg-Turkish". Validi takes this to mean that the Chorasmians spoke an Iranian language related to Ossetian; he thinks it likely, at the same time, that the language of these Alans, who had migrated to the land of the Khazars, must have differed in some measure from the language of the Caucasian Ossetes.²⁵

It was Henning who first subjected to linguistic scrutiny the Chorasmian texts discovered by Validi; he came to the conclusion that, although the Chorasmian language shares many important characteristics with Ossetian, nevertheless, on the whole it is nearer to Sogdian, while it also has a number of characteristic features found neither in Sogdian nor in Ossetian. The features shared with Ossetian consist, according to Henning, chiefly of the phonemic changes $\check{s} > s$ and $\check{c} > c$, though the change from $\check{s} > s$ was not entirely completed in Chorasmian.²⁶

Thus the scrutiny of Chorasmian texts has for the time being failed to supply linguistic facts that might be regarded as a decisive proof of the theory affirming the Chorasmian origin of the Alans. This circumstance obviously influenced Validi's mind when he came to the conclusion that the language of the Alans, who had migrated to the land of the Khazars, must have been somewhat different from that of the Caucasian Ossetes. This is, naturally, equivalent to admitting that the Chorasmian origin of the Alans—Ossetes (a conjecture based on considerations of history) cannot be proved as a linguistic proposition.

These negative linguistic conclusions, which contradict the evidence of historical sources, were, naturally, far from reassuring to those advocating the eastern origin of the Ossetes; hence several new attempts were made recently to try and prove the close contact of Ossetian with the languages of North-Eastern Iran or its eastern origin. Among these attempts let us first consider Freiman's works. He discovered a considerable quantity of fresh Chorasmian linguistic material, and in elaborating it touched several times on the question of the relation between Ossetian and Chorasmian. Freiman's investigations have established that correspondences between Ossetian and Chorasmian are not restricted to the phonemic changes $\check{s} > s$ and $\check{c} > c$, pointed out by Henning, but extend to a number of phenomena of different kinds. Thus Freiman has shown that the phonemic change $-ti > -ci$ is found both in Ossetian and in Chorasmian: see *e. g.* Chorasmian *akic* 'делает' ~ Ossetian *kānənc* 'делают'; in some cases the Old Iranian group of phonemes $-9r-$ has similar corresponding forms in both languages, *e. g.* Chorasmian *arcivak* 'third' ~ Ossetian *ärtä* 'three'; Old Iranian initial *h-* has disappeared in many cases both from Ossetian and Chorasmian, *e. g.* Chorasmian *iβdac* 'seventy' ~ Ossetian *āv dai* 'seventy' ~ Old Iranian *haptāti*; the plural suffix $-tā$ characteristic of Ossetian is found also in Chorasmian, *e. g.* *niṣōsic* 'слушатели', *nikanc* 'колья', *sparc* 'шиты'.²⁷ Freiman attributes very great importance to these correspondences when pronouncing judgment on the

²⁵ See ZDMG XC (1936), *26* foll. and also *Ibn Fadlān's Reisebericht*, Leipzig 1939, 14, 125 foll., 137. [Add. note: Cf. also V. Minorsky, *Hudūd al-'Ālam*, London 1937, 481.]

²⁶ ZDMG XC (1936), *30* foll.

²⁷ See A. A. Фрейман, CB IV (1947), 157 foll., CB V (1948), 191 foll., CB VI (1949), 63 foll.

origin and place of the Ossetian language. He states emphatically that “the transference to the West of our knowledge concerning the linguistic Middle Ages of Eastern Iran (this is Freiman’s description of the discovery and elaboration of the Chorasmian linguistic material) has made it possible to lay a firm foundation for those linguistic bridges which connect more closely the Chorasmian language with the language of the Alan—Ās, *i. e.* with the language of the Ossetes, those emigrants who had their homes in Xwārizm”.²⁸ In one instance Freiman makes the attempt to trace back the connections of the Ossetian and Chorasmian or Saka languages, as far as the fifth century B. C.: he tries to explain the name *Skunxa*, the Saka chieftain defeated by Darius, from the Ossetian verb *sk’uānxun* ‘отличаться’.²⁹

Tolstov has called attention to another interesting proof of the Chorasmian origin of the Alans—Ossetes. He pointed out that one of the Turkmen tribes of South-Eastern Turkmenia bears the name *Alan*, a name which denotes also one of the subsidiary tribes of the Salirs. According to Tolstov, the Turkmen tribe Alan differs in a number of ethnographic peculiarities from the surrounding Salirs; one may observe among them, for instance, a strong tendency toward tribal endogamy and marriage within the clan; they wear white clothing, etc. It is especially noteworthy that a tradition has been preserved among them, according to which they migrated to their present habitation from the Mangishlak Peninsula where, they say, there used to be “a large fortress known by the name of Alan”. The interesting point is that there exist, in fact, ruins of a fortress known as *Alan-kala* (“Alan fortress”) on the north-western borders of Xwārizm, between the Sea of Aral and the Mangishlak Peninsula. So there can be no doubt that the tradition of the Alan Turkmen tribe has a historical value, and that we may regard this tribe as Turkicized descendants of the Alans who used to live on the territory of Xwārizm and on the plateau of Ust-Urt.³⁰

It was Tolstov, again, who pointed out that the name of one of the Chorasmian rulers appearing on his coins as *wrθwmχ*, while in Bīrūnī it figures in the form *’rθmwχ*, bears a close resemblance to the name of *Uruzmag*, a well-known hero in the Nart sagas of the Ossetes.³¹ This correspondence — if it can be linguistically verified — supplies another interesting datum for the historical contacts between Alans—Ossetes and Chorasmians. We may establish, at all events, that the passage in Bīrūnī and the reading of the Chorasmian coins give two different forms of the name: 1. *warθumax* and 2. *arθamux*. But the same duality appears also in Ossetian as, beside *Uruzmag*, there also occur the forms *Wärāzmäg*, *Orāzmäg*, and *Wērāzmäg*.³² On the basis of these and the Abadzech form *Urzames* we may suppose the existence of an earlier form **Warzəmag* ~ **Warzumag* which is quite close to the form *Warθumax* of the Chorasmian ruler’s name.

There is no doubt that Freiman’s observations and Tolstov’s data have brought forward a lot of important new material to the question of Alanic—Ossetian history and language. But we must not ignore the fact that, while Freiman’s researches have considerably increased the number of linguistic correspondences between Ossetian and Chorasmian, they have also revealed more fully that Chorasmian stands much

²⁸ See ИАН СССР Отд. лит. и языка, VII (1948), 238 foll.

²⁹ *Ibid* 239.

³⁰ See С. П. Толстов, ВДИ 1948, I, 197. Similar data with regard to the Alans near the Sea of Aral, as *e. g.* Firdusi’s *Diḏ-i Alānān* and the place-name *Qizil-Alan* in the Turkmen steppes, have been earlier pointed out by Marquart, *Über das Volkstum der Komänen*, AGGW XIII, Berlin 1914, 106 foll. and by Minorsky, *Hudūd al-‘Ālam*, London 1937, 481.

³¹ See Древний Хорезм. Москва 1948, 189, По следам древнехорезмийской цивилизации. Москва—Ленинград 1948, 161, foll.

³² See В. И. Абаев, Язык и мышление V (1935), 281.

closer to Sogdian than to Alanic—Ossetian. For this reason we need not be surprised that some scholars, *e. g.* Altheim, continue to regard the passage in Birūnī about the language of the Alans and Chorasmians just as problematical as before. According to Altheim, Birūnī could certainly not mean that the Chorasmian and Ossetian languages were especially close to each other with regard to their origin: the meaning of the passage is that the Alans or Ās took over certain linguistic peculiarities from the Chorasmians, in whose neighbourhood they once lived, and that the same applies also to the Pechenegs.³³ For the rest, Altheim accepts the identity of the present Ossetians with the medieval Ās and the ancient "Ασιοι, the conquerors of Bactria, *i. e.* he accepts the thesis of the eastern origin of the Ossetes.³⁴ His attempt, however, to interpret the passage in Birūnī in the light of late historical contacts between Chorasmians and Ossetes, instead of assuming an identity of origin or linguistic community between these two peoples, must be, therefore, ascribed to a negative estimate of the linguistic connections between Alanic—Ossetian and Chorasmian.

Parallel with the linguistic research on the relations of Ossetian and Chorasmian there also emerged several historical combinations which tried to solve the origin of the Ossetians and the Alans in the direction indicated by Charpentier. One of these combinations is Vernadsky's. He has renewed the conjecture about the supposed identity of the Wu-sun and the "Ασιοι, as well as the Asiani, the Ās, and the Ossetes. He has, moreover, introduced new elements into this combination by trying to prove that the names *Anti*, "Αντες, and *Yen-ts'ai* belong to the same group of peoples' names.³⁵ But these combinations of Vernadsky's raise very serious historical and linguistic difficulties.³⁶

Maenchen-Helfen also follows in Charpentier's footsteps with regard to the origin of the Ossetes and the Ās,³⁷ but by utilizing the results of recent investigations he is able to set this problem into a much wider framework. Under the influence of Haloun's arguments, Maenchen-Helfen rejects the identification of the Wu-sun and the Asiani, and proposes a new, wider combination in its stead. He tries to prove that the name *Ārsi* used by the Tokharians about themselves is identical with Pliny's *Arsi*, Ptolemy's Ἀρσιῖτις as well as with the *Aorsi* who came to be called Alans later on. These peoples or peoples' names, to which he adds the *al(-l)ārisiya* mentioned in Mas'ūdī, are, in his view, identical with *Ās*, the old name of the Ossetes and its different varieties. All these peoples are, at the same time, Tokharians, *i. e.* the Yüeh-chih of the Chinese, since *Ārsi* is the name used by the Tokharians for themselves. In Maenchen-Helfen's opinion the name *Tokhar*, itself, is found among the Ossetes in the tribal name *Digor*. Maenchen-Helfen, himself, must have felt that these identifications of peoples and peoples' names raise a host of historical difficulties. For this reason he tried to render them more probable by assuming the presence of a number of historical layers. According to his account, the tribal name of the Yüeh-chih was *Togar*, while their ruling group bore the name of *Kusha* (transcribed as Yüeh-chih by the Chinese). This peoples came under the rule of the Sacae who called themselves *Ārsi* (= *Aorsi*, *Arsi*, "Ασιοι, Asiani, Ās, etc.). The people, formed as the result of this *Togar-Ārsi* stratification, was later divided into several groups. One

³³ F. Altheim, *Literatur und Gesellschaft im ausgehenden Altertum*, Halle/Saale 1950, II, 210.

³⁴ See *Der Hellenismus in Mittelasiien: Saeculum I* (1950), 281.

³⁵ G. Vernadsky, *Ancient Russia*,³ New Haven 1946, 82 foll., *Byzantion* XVI (1942—44), 81 fol.

³⁶ See my remarks in *RHC N. S. V* (1947), 230 foll.

³⁷ *JAOS* LXV (1945), 71 foll. O. Maenchen-Helfen himself refers to Charpentier but he exaggerates in connecting the identification of *Ārsi-Asiani* with Charpentier (79), since the word *Ārsi* was introduced into the Tokharian controversy only by Sieg *SBAW* 1918, 560 foll.

group migrated towards the West, and became the ancestors of the *As-Digūr* among the present Ossetes. Maenchen-Helfen distinguishes, moreover, the Alans from the *Ās*. The upshot of these identifications is that, while the Tokharian problem becomes ever-simplified, the formation of the Ossetes turns out to be the result of a very complex ethnical stratification.

There is no doubt that, even with the assumption of these historical strata, Maenchen-Helfen's conclusions contain many elements that are hypothetical or entirely unsupported. His attempt, however, to explain the formation of the present Ossetian people as the result of repeated ethnical stratifications, in contrast to former conjectures deserves close attention, in any case.

H. W. Bailey's recent investigations in the study of the origin of Ossetian vocabulary have a very important bearing on the contact of Ossetian with the Eastern Iranian languages as well as on the eastern origin of the Ossetes. Since the studies of Hübschmann (*Etymologie und Lautlehre der ossetischen Sprache*) and Miller, Bailey's works may be regarded as the most important step forward in the study of the origin of the Ossetian vocabulary. Bailey does not connect the Wu-sun with the Asiani; he even dismisses the name *Ārsi* which he regards simply as the Tokharian equivalent of the Northwestern Prakrit form of the Sanskrit word *ārya-* 'beggar monk'. Thus he ultimately identifies the old *Ās* and the present Ossetes only with the *'Asioi*. At the same time, he derives the name *Ās*, Ossetian *Asi* ~ *Assi* from an earlier form **ārsya-*, and connects this with the *al-(l)ārisiya* found in Mas'ūdī as well as with the names *Arsi* and *'Apσῆτις*. Thus Bailey regards the Ossetes as the descendants of the *'Asioi*, an Eastern Iranian tribe which conquered Bactria; he attempts to support this view with the results of his study in the field of the Ossetian vocabulary. He tries to prove the presence in Ossetian of a considerable number of words, the exact equivalent of which can be demonstrated only in Sogdian and Saka. In Bailey's view, these correspondences indicate that the ancestors of the *Ās* were in close contact with the Chorasmians, Sogdians, and the forebears of the Afghans. This symbiosis is put by Bailey to the third century B. C. since the Iranian names in the Greek inscriptions of South Russia, and the earliest linguistic remains of the Sogdians, (both types going back to the second century A. D.,) reveal, in Bailey's opinion, clearly defined linguistic individuality, so that the state of symbiosis must have existed several centuries before.³⁸ This train of thought shows also that, during the period of symbiosis of the *Ās*, Sogdians, Chorasmians, etc., Bailey assumes the linguistic community of their respective languages, otherwise he might just as well have assumed the existence of a state of symbiosis at a later period when these tongues developed into fully-fledged separate languages. Thus, it would seem that, ultimately, Bailey sees the relation of these languages to one another from the angle of the family-tree theory.

Bailey's works have considerably enriched our knowledge concerning the Eastern Iranian contacts of the Ossetian language, in general, and the Ossetian vocabulary, in particular. But while stressing this, we cannot fail to remark that his conclusions cannot, in all respects, be regarded as final, either from the historical or the linguistic point of view. First of all, there is no need whatever to assume linguistic unity, for a period, when peoples speaking different languages are living together. We have seen above that the *Ās* and the Chorasmians were living together as late as the tenth century A. D. — yet there is no question of a linguistic unity between

³⁸ See H. W. Bailey, *TPhS* 1945, 1 foll., *TPhS* 1946, 202 foll. *TPhS* 1947, 142 foll., 150 foll., *BSOAS* XIII (1949—50), 135.

Ossetian and Chorasmian. So there is no inevitability, either, in Bailey's deduction, according to which Ossetian must have been living together or at least have been in contact with other languages of Eastern Iran about the third century B. C. From the methodological angle, too, Bailey's procedure of trying to determine the relation of Ossetian to the Eastern Iranian languages, on the basis of vocabulary, is open to objection, especially if we have to count in Ossetian with a complex Eastern Iranian stratification. Thus it is clear that the problems raised and discussed by Bailey are still waiting to be examined from a number of different angles.

After this survey of recent research on the position of the Ossetian language, we see clearly those major groups of problems which it is necessary to solve if we wish to attain a certain degree of certitude with regard to the Eastern Iranian connections of Ossetian, or the problem of the North Iranian group of languages as a whole. These groups of problems may be summed up as follows:

1. The relation of Ossetian to the ancient Iranian languages of South Russia. The clarification of this problem is indispensable if we want to see clearly the relation of Ossetes, Alans, Sarmatians, and Scythians.

2. Within the above group of problems the question of plural formation with *-tati* requires a separate examination since it has always been a pivotal question in research and the available material is considerable. In the eyes of the majority of scholars this method of forming the plural is one of the decisive proofs for the close connection of Scythian—Sarmatian—Alanic—Ossetian on the one hand, and of the Eastern Iranian languages, on the other. The question, however, is whether this plural suffix really existed in Scythian, and whether one is justified in regarding this morphological peculiarity of the language as a dialectological criterion.

3. It is necessary to clarify the mutual relations of Alanic and Ossetian. This work requires, of course, a thorough re-examination and re-valuation of the linguistic remains of the Alans.

4. The solution of the same problem also requires the re-examination and re-valuation of the Alanic loan-words in Hungarian. As we have seen above, Abaev ascribed a very important role to these loan-words in clearing up the relation of Alanic and Ossetian. Their testimony was regarded as decisive by Sköld, too, in the question of Ossetian dialects.

5. The relation of Ossetian to the Eastern Iranian languages. The discovery of the Chorasmian texts, the results of historical research, as well as the works of Henning, Freiman, and Bailey on the subject, have made the clarification of this problem one of the most pressing tasks of Ossetian linguists.

6. The stratification of the Iranian elements in the Ossetian vocabulary. This question was raised by the possibility that the Ossetian people were formed by various Iranian tribes being superimposed, one upon the other. The existence of such a possibility was clearly demonstrated by Maenchen-Helfen's results, even if the latter require substantial corrections in many respects. Moreover, if we have to count with different ethnical strata in the case of the Ossetian people, this must find a reflection in their vocabulary, too. Thus, this question is one of the most exciting tasks of future research.

Of these groups of problems, we are going to discuss in this essay the relations of the ancient Iranian languages of Southern Russia to one another, and to Ossetian.

2. Proto-Iranian and Ossetian

If we wish to clarify the problems connected with the language of the Sarmatian tribes of Southern Russia and its relation to Ossetian, we have to bear in mind, first of all, two considerations. We have seen above that, in judging this question, the great majority of scholars, *e. g.* Miller, Vasmer, Lommel, Kretschmer, Sköld and Abaev, started from the theory of the family-tree of languages. This manifested itself chiefly in the fact that, the earlier the stage of language they examined, the less inclined they became (often flying in the face of practically palpable linguistic facts) to assume even a slight degree of linguistic differentiation. The result was that they regarded the language of the Scythians and Sarmatians as uniform, and considered even the present Ossetian dialectal differentiation to be an entirely new development. Since the family-tree theory has thus exercised a decisive influence on research concerned with Ossetian and the language of the Iranian tribes of South Russia we have to raise the question whether it is right to accept this theory as a basis of our investigations. In order to answer it, we will examine the application of the family-tree theory in some examples taken from linguistic history.

One of the chief aims of comparative linguistics, based on the family-tree theory, was to try and reconstruct the homogeneous linguistic status or parent language from which later dialects and languages were to develop. Says Edgar Sturtevant in "An introduction to linguistic science", 154: "Comparative grammar reconstructs certain features of the language spoken by the original, unseparated community, on the basis of corresponding features of the descendent languages." In order to attain this objective, scholars used to compare the different languages belonging to the same group or family of languages, noting their identical features and regarding these as characteristic of the ancient, homogeneous linguistic status. Thus in reconstructing the Proto-Iranian linguistic condition which, in its turn, was preceded by the Aryan linguistic condition, Bartholomae utilized those correspondences existing between Old Persian and the language of the Avesta as well as those existing between the language of the Avesta and some modern Iranian language, chiefly Modern Persian³⁹. But the adequacy of this method is very questionable. Following a critical hint by J. Schmidt, Kretschmer has pointed out long ago that certain linguistic phenomena, though present in all separate languages, must not, in every case, be regarded as characteristic of the fundamental language, while conversely, it is sometimes only one language that preserves ancient linguistic traits.⁴⁰ But it is not only the linguistics methods of the family-tree theory that have aroused grave doubts: its historical assumptions, too, have proved untenable. There is no doubt that one cannot assume the existence of populous societies possessing a unitary organization and speaking a homogeneous language in the early periods of history⁴¹ — though this assumption is implicit in the family-tree theory. There is an increasing body of evidence, derived especially from archaeological research, which shows that the idea of homogeneous linguistic communities, and of corresponding homogeneous peoples, has

³⁹ *Grundriß der iranischen Philologie*, I, 1, Straßburg 1895—1901, 3.

⁴⁰ *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*, Göttingen 1895, 7 foll. Recent criticism of the family-tree theory is contained in Bonfante: *Language XXIII* (1947), 350 where he expounds the neolinguist position with regard to the family-tree theory. Recent pronouncements in favour of the family-tree theory are by Sturtevant: *Language XXIII* (1947), 376 foll. and Lane: *Language XXV* (1949), 333 foll.

⁴¹ See Altheim's telling remarks in *Italien und Rom*, Amsterdam—Leipzig 1941, 152 foll. and *Literatur und Gesellschaft im ausgehenden Altertum*, II, Halle/Saale 1950, 113 foll.

to be dropped entirely.⁴² But even if we refrain from discussing the whole problem of the family-tree theory, and do not go beyond the reconstruction of the Proto-Iranian linguistic state, the deficiencies of this method are obvious.

We must raise, first of all, the problem of sources. By setting the two Old Iranian languages (Old Persian and the language of the Avesta) against the Middle Iranian and Modern Iranian languages, one may easily create an impression that seems to be in perfect harmony with the family-tree theory. The Modern Iranian languages are undoubtedly, much more numerous than the Middle Iranian ones, while the latter considerably exceed in number the two Old Iranian languages. This temporal distribution of independent languages and dialects is apt to rouse, at first sight, the idea of a progressive linguistic differentiation in the mind of the spectator. One must not forget, however, that this idea of progressive differentiation is due only to the scantiness of material. We have a certain amount of data about practically all the Modern Iranian languages and dialects; of the medieval Iranian languages (in spite of the splendid discoveries of recent decades) there exist data of only a few, while of the Old Iranian languages only two are known to us. We must also bear in mind that there is a qualitative difference between these data. Those dating from the present age derive in part from languages or dialects that are not written down, while the languages known to us from the Middle Ages, or from antiquity, are almost entirely of a literary or written character. If we take these facts into consideration, we have to admit that there is absolutely no evidence to show that linguistic differences, among the tribes and peoples speaking Iranian languages, were considerably less in antiquity than in the Middle Ages, or at the present time. Thus it would be an entirely unwarrantable assumption to regard, for instance, the language of the Old Persian inscriptions as the homogeneous language of the Persians, taken as a body of people. Herodotus enumerates in his work ten Persian tribes (I 125) which lived scattered over a wide area and showed considerable differences in their material culture.⁴³ Bearing this in mind, one would certainly hesitate to identify the language of the Old Persian inscriptions, let us say, with the language of the nomadic Persian Asagartiya tribe. The same applies also to the Medes. Herodotus enumerates six different Median tribes (I 101): even if one of these names denotes a social stratum rather than a tribe, there can be no doubt as to

⁴² See Paret, *WaG* VIII (1942), 53 foll., Kühn, *IPEK* XV (1941—42), 256 foll. Especially characteristic is Pittioni's statement in *Erasmus* II (1949), 296: "Die archäologische Forschung der letzten Jahre hat uns eben zum Umlernen gezwungen. Noch vor kurzer Zeit der Meinung verfallen, daß die einzelnen indogermanischen Völker wie Zweige gleichzeitig aus dem Stamme sprießen, wobei die Wurzeln dieses Stammes im norddeutsch-skandinavischen Raum gelegen sein sollen, lernen wir nun immer deutlicher, daß nicht die Filiation uns das Werden der indogermanischen Einzelvölker erschließt, sondern nur die Agglutination oder die Substrattheorie, also die Tatsache, daß von den wichtigen oberpaläolithischen Kulturen aufwärts Schicht auf Schicht gelegt wird, wobei diese über weite Strecken hin gemeinsamen Schichten Verwandtschaften und Beziehungen erzeugen, die in ihrer Abfolge Gleichzeitiges und Aufeinanderfolgendes verbinden und damit ein mehr als kompliziertes Bild einer Kultur- und Völkerentfaltung erweisen". — Recently, even the adherents of the family-tree theory have started admitting that the parent language or fundamental language could not have been homogeneous. See e. g. Sturtevant's following words "We must admit the existence of dialectic differences within Proto-Indo-European. At present we cannot do very much about such features; but it is important to recognize their existence". (An Introduction to Linguistic Science³, New Haven 1948, 167.) This would mean, of course, giving up the idea of the parent language and the attempts at its reconstruction; so Sturtevant hastens to add: "In theory at least, a period of dialectic differentiation preceded the final separation of the Indo-European languages from the parent stock". Thus he succeeds in finding a formula combining the idea of a parent language with dialectal differentiation. But the only concrete basis of the whole theory is the actual existence of dialectal differentiation.

⁴³ See Christensen, *Die Iranier*, 236.

the tribal divisions of the Medes.⁴⁴ Thus, there is no ground whatever for assuming the existence of a homogeneous Median language at the time. On the contrary, there are certain features in the investigations conducted hitherto which lend full support to the view that in the case of both Persians and Medes we have to count, at the very outset of their appearance in history, with a linguistic differentiation that accords with their division into tribes. Already, Geiger hit upon the idea of a dialectal differentiation among the Medes, when asking the question whether the Old Persian word *farnah-* is not borrowed from one of the Median dialects.⁴⁵ The investigations of Andreas, Lentz, Tedesco, and Herzfeld have contributed to the development of this suggestion. Following a hint by Andreas, Lentz has pointed out that the Old Persian *farnah-* is certainly an old loan-word from Median; but among the present dialects it is only in Siwandī that we find the correspondence of *f-* to initial χ^v- , while in the northern dialects the usual corresponding group of phonemes is $v\chi-$, $vh-$. Since, according to the testimony of the Old Persian word, the development $\chi^v > f-$ must have taken place in Median as early as the sixth century B. C., while over the larger part of the linguistic area the initial χ^v- has been preserved, there can be no doubt that there already existed a considerable dialectal differentiation in Median at this time⁴⁶. Tedesco's investigations concerning the dialectology of the West Iranian Turfan texts led to the same result. Tedesco has demonstrated that in the northwestern Turfan texts some phonemes and groups of phonemes have a double correspondence: thus e. g. intervocalic *d*(δ) is usually preserved but in some words it has a corresponding *-h-*, etc. Since in the southwestern Turfan texts it is the phoneme *y* that corresponds to intervocalic *d*, this double correspondence may be explained only by assuming that the language of the northwestern Turfan texts is based, not on one dialect, but on *several northwestern* dialects.⁴⁷ This dialectal differentiation must reach back into far antiquity, as is clearly shown by the juxtaposition of two data: the name *Fradāta* was transcribed in ancient sources, as early as the second century B. C., in the forms *Phraates* or *Phrahates* which reflect already an Iranian form *Frahāta*; at the same time, Ptolemy gives the name of Isfahān in the form *Ἀσπάδανα* as late as the second century A. D.⁴⁸ Thus in the northwestern territory dialectal differentiation may be traced back to the sixth century B. C., if no further, and the same is true also of the Persian territories. It is again Tedesco's investigations which have demonstrated that the language of the Old Persian inscriptions could not have been the direct antecedent of Middle and Modern Persian dialects: 'Altechtpersisch', i. e. the Old Iranian antecedent of the south-western Turfan texts, must have been a different dialect.⁴⁹ Accordingly, there are indubitable linguistic facts indicating that, in the case of both Medes and Persians, one has to deal with different dialects right at the outset of their historical career; it is extremely likely that this dialectal differentiation was connected with a division into tribes.

In this case, however, the reconstruction of the Proto-Iranian linguistic stage have to be subjected to a thorough revision. According to Bartholomae's theory, the Aryan Parent Language split up into two essentially homogeneous languages

⁴⁴ See Christensen, *Die Iranier*, 233. H. S. Nyberg, in *Die Religionen des alten Iran*, Leipzig 1938, 335, regards the *Boudioi*, too, as a caste of priests; with regard to the other data, however, he himself bears witness to the authenticity of Herodotus' account.

⁴⁵ *Grundriß der iranischen Philologie*, I 2, 423.

⁴⁶ Lentz, *ZII* IV (1926), 288. See also Herzfeld, *AMI* VII (1935), 40 foll.

⁴⁷ Tedesco, *MO* XV (1921), 195, 205 foll., 246, 253.

⁴⁸ Tedesco, *MO* XV (1921), 185; Herzfeld, *AMI* VII (1935), 15.

⁴⁹ Tedesco, *MO* XV (1921), 248.

one of which he simply called 'Proto-Iranian'. This 'Proto-Iranian language' was, however, a purely formal linguistic concept, the contents of which were determined by the changes which took place in 'Proto-Iranian' from the time of its separation from the Aryan parent language until its disintegration. On these premises Bartholomae acted quite logically when he utilized, in reconstructing the Proto-Iranian linguistic state, those changes which he found both in Old Persian and in the language of the Avesta, since, according to his theory these common changes must have occurred in Proto-Iranian while changes peculiar to one of them must have taken place in the separate Old Iranian languages.⁵⁰ This theory is entirely logical: yet historically — even apart from its unproved and unsubstantiated premises — it is extremely unlikely. As we have pointed out above, only two of the Old Iranian languages supply us with a fair number of linguistic remains; of these, the language of the Avesta has undergone considerable distortion during the process of transmission, so that its value as a source for the history of phonemes is frequently open to doubt; while the language of the Old Persian inscriptions only gives us some insight into the language of a single Persian tribe. It follows that, actually, we have only data about an insignificant proportion of Old Iranian languages or dialects; this circumstance makes the reconstruction of a 'Proto-Iranian language' an arduous and rather hopeless task. There is no evidence whatever to show the changes, common to the Old Persian inscriptions and the language of the Avesta, took place also in the numerous other Old Iranian languages and dialects unknown to us; consequently, the changes determining the 'Proto-Iranian language' necessarily elude our grasp. Similarly, there are no indications whatever to show whether some, or even a considerable part, of the changes peculiar to one language alone, do not go back to Proto-Iranian times. To take only one example: one of the most definite features of the reconstructed 'Proto-Iranian language' is the change of initial *su-* > *hy-* > *χ^v-*; see e. g. Old Indian *svarnara-* ~ Avestan *χ^varānah-*. But it is precisely this word which we find already in Old Persian, in the form *farnah-*, as an Old Median loan-word. Thus the development of the Aryan initial group of phonemes *su-* was already different in the dialects of Median, one of the Old Iranian languages; there is no evidence whatever as to the date when these differences developed. There is no evidence, either, to show that the form *farnah-* developed, through an intermediate form **χ^varnah-*, from Aryan **svarnas-*: one may easily suppose that in one part of the Median linguistic territory there was a direct phonemic development *su-* > *f-*. This would naturally imply that the phonemic development *su-* > *χ^v-* was not characteristic of the whole Proto-Iranian language, i. e. that 'Proto-Iranian' was not a homogeneous language, but was divided into different languages or dialects. This idea leads to the obliteration of boundaries between Proto-Iranian and Old Iranian.

There is no doubt that, from the angle of the family-tree theory, the chief distinctive mark of the 'Proto-Iranian language' was precisely its homogeneity, the uniformity of the changes separating it from Aryan; owing to the emergence of features peculiar to some languages only, this uniformity gave place to the diversity of the Old Iranian languages. If the existence of such a homogeneous state of the language is not capable of demonstration, there is, in fact, no need to adhere to the concept of a 'Proto-Iranian language'. We have to point out, too, the essential difference that exists between the concept of 'Proto-Iranian', on the one hand, and the designations of 'Old Iranian', 'Middle Iranian', and 'Modern Iranian', on the other. 'Proto-Iranian', together with 'Aryan' and 'Indo-European', is a purely formal lin-

⁵⁰ See *Grundriß der iranischen Philologie*, I 1, 1 foll.

guistic concept denoting a homogeneous unit. 'Old Iranian', 'Middle Iranian', and 'Modern Iranian' are, on the other hand, historical concepts which do not admit of a clear linguistic definition. It has never yet occurred to anybody to reconstruct a homogeneous Old Iranian or Middle Iranian language which would possess common distinctive marks: these expressions are used to denote the Iranian languages known to us from different periods of history. Hence, even within one and the same Iranian language, these expressions do not usually denote stages of development admitting of clear linguistic delimitation. It follows that there is no road leading from the historical concept of the 'Old Iranian languages' to the formal linguistic concept of the 'Proto-Iranian language'.

The data supplied by Herodotus about the Persian and Median tribes date from the fifth century B. C. There is no doubt, however, that the formation of both the Median and the Persian tribes must be assigned to a considerably earlier period. Hence it is obvious, too, that the linguistic differences, observable among the Median and Persian tribes in the sixth and fifth centuries, may be traced back into earlier times. An examination of the Iranian names found in the cuneiform sources leads us to the conclusion that a considerable part of the linguistic differences observable in the sixth century may be traced back to the ninth. As early as 712 we come across a prince called *Auarparna*; from the beginning of the seventh century we know the names of princes *Štirparna* and *Ēparna*: in these names the element *-parna* is a transcription of the word *farnah-* which we have discussed above.⁵¹ Hence the double correspondence of χ^v- ~ *f-* to Aryan *su-* goes back to the eighth century. During the reign of Salmanassar there is mention in 854 of a prince called *Kundašpi*, about 740 of a prince bearing the name of *Kuštašpi*. The corresponding forms of these two names in other parts of the Old Iranian linguistic territory would be **Vindāspa-* and **Vištāspa-*; hence the phonemic change of initial *vi-* > *gu-* ~ *ku-* may be traced back, in this case, to the ninth century.⁵²

All this combines to show that the differences in the Old Iranian languages or dialects reach back in fact, into the Proto-Iranian period, *i. e.* into the age preceding the historical appearance of the Iranian tribes⁵³. If we wish to continue employing the concept of 'Proto-Iranian' as a historical designation in linguistics, it is most apposite to our purpose to mean by it the linguistic facts, languages, dialects, and linguistic condition of the period preceding the historical emergence of the Medes and Persians and the foundation of a state by them. The only question is whether the time limit of this historical period may be clearly defined, and whether it may be organically connected with the period of the 'Aryan language', a concept known to us

⁵¹ See *e. g.* Nyberg, *Die Religionen des alten Iran*, 334; Herzfeld, *AMI VII* (1935). 28 foll. Herzfeld's contention that the *p* of the Akkad script stands in these names for *vh* is without any foundation. First, the example quoted by him — Iranian *Gundofarr* ~ Indian *Guduvhara* — illustrates quite a different point (here *f* is transcribed as *vh*, not *vh* as *p*); secondly, the word *farnah-* is transcribed even in later cuneiform texts as *parna-*: **Frādafarnah-* = **Ip-ra-(a-)du-par-na-*, **Dādafarnah-* = **Da-da-par-na-* (see W. Eilers, *Iranische Beamtennamen in der keilschriftlichen Überlieferung*, I, Leipzig 1940, 97).

⁵² See Kretschmer, *KZ IV* (1928); Nyberg, *Die Religionen des alten Iran*, 333.

⁵³ This was clearly realized, with regard to Median, by Herzfeld, *AMI VII* (1935), 23 foll.: "In einem so großen gebiet kann von anfang an nicht nur ein dialekt gesprochen sein: medisch bedeutet eine ganze gruppe. Die assyrischen, babylonischen, elamischen, aramäischen und griechischen umschreibungen medischer orts- und personennamen lassen davon allerhand erkennen... Die aufgabe ist, was da zu erkennen ist und was die heute noch lebenden dialektreste bewahrt haben, mit den großen unterteilen Mediens in verbindung zu bringen, in denen sich uralte stammesunterschiede ausprägen".

from linguistics. According to the testimony of archaeology⁵⁴ and of historical sources, the migration of the Medes and Persians to the territory of Iran may be assigned to the end of the second millennium, or the beginning of the first millennium B. C.⁵⁵ This is also the conjectural date established by Herzfeld for the occurrence of those changes which separate Iranian (or 'Proto-Iranian' in Bartholomae's terminology) from Aryan.⁵⁶ Herzfeld's argument is supported, for the time being, by a single linguistic fact.⁵⁷ Additional corroboration may be derived from the Aryan names found among the Hurrians.⁵⁸ According to the testimony of these names, on the western borders of later Iran, there lived in the 14th century B. C. certain ethnic elements whose language did not yet show those phonemic changes which distinguish the Old Iranian languages from Old Indian. Thus, historically, one may speak of Proto-Iranian languages during the period that extends roughly from the migration of the Iranian tribes into the territory of Iran, to the formation of the Persian state. But this Proto-Iranian period of history cannot be organically connected with the period of the 'Aryan language'. In this case 'Proto-Iranian', precisely like 'Old Indian', would be a historical-geographical concept, while 'Aryan' is a formal linguistic designation. This qualitative difference in the ideas is reflected also in the attempts to determine the Aryan linguistic elements found among the Hurrians. There were some scholars who, on the basis of their phonemic characteristics, regarded them as Old Indian.⁵⁹ Others⁶⁰, feeling that 'Old Indian' is essentially a historical and geographical concept which can hardly be applied to linguistic remains from the Near East, consider them to be Aryan⁶¹.

But even if the idea and reconstruction of a homogeneous Proto-Iranian language must be given up, this naturally does not mean giving up, at the same time, the idea of a Proto-Iranian stage in the history of Iranian phonemes, or the reconstruction, in general, of Old Iranian and Proto-Iranian forms. Nevertheless we have to realize that one may reconstruct, with a greater or lesser degree of probability, the Old Iranian or Proto-Iranian forms of only such words that are attested in certain definite, individual languages: the reconstruction of forms pretending to be of universal validity, equally applicable to all Iranian languages, is a hopeless task; therefore, in the course of this essay, phonemic reconstruction will be employed only in the sense outlined above; conjectural Old Iranian or Proto-Iranian forms will mean only forms that may be supposed to have existed in the Old Iranian or Proto-Iranian stage of a particular language, or in general, forms that may have existed in one Old Iranian or Proto-Iranian language.

Thus, in investigating the language of the Iranian tribes in South Russia, as well as their relation to Ossetian, we have to point out that these languages lend support in two respects to the criticism of attempts at reconstructing the 'Proto-

⁵⁴ See Ghirshman, *Fouilles de Sialk*, II. Paris 1939; the results are summed up by Altheim: *Saeculum I* (1950), 294 foll.

⁵⁵ See e. g. Herzfeld, *AMI VIII* (1937), 46 foll., *AMI IX* (1938), 164 foll., *Archaeological History of Iran*, London 1935, 9 foll.

⁵⁶ *AMI VIII* (1937), 46 foll., *Altpersische Inschriften*, Berlin 1938, 183 foll.

⁵⁷ This is obviously the reason why Herzfeld's conclusions are regarded as premature by Eilers, *Iranische Beamtennamen in der keilschriftlichen Überlieferung*, 117.

⁵⁸ See e. g. Christensen, *Die Iranier*, 209 foll., Nyberg, *Die Religionen des alten Iran*, 330 foll.

⁵⁹ See e. g. A. Götze, *Kleinasien: Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, III. Abt. I. Teil. III. Bd. 3. Abschn. 1. Lief., München 1933, 59, where fuller bibliography is given.

⁶⁰ See e. g. Christensen, *Die Iranier*, 210; Nyberg, *Die Religionen des alten Iran*, 332. — Herzfeld himself felt that he was 'anticipating' when applying the names 'Old Indian' and 'Indo-Iranian' to the Hurrian Aryans: see *Archaeological History of Iran*. 9.

⁶¹ Cf. also Oldenberg, *Die Religion des Veda*³⁻⁴, Stuttgart—Berlin 1923, 24 foll.

Iranian language.' First, there is Bartholomae's suggestion that the initial group of phonemes *si-* in Proto-Iranian lost the element *i* through an intermediate grade *š-*, and was ultimately reduced to the phoneme *s-*,; e. g. Avestan *saēnō* ~ Old Indian *śyenās*, Avestan *sāmahe* 'des schwarzen' ~ Old Indian *śyāmas*, Ossetian *sau* ~ Old Indian *śyāvas*⁶². Since the formulation of Bartholomae's theory, the Middle Iranian linguistic material at our disposal has been considerably enriched and partly supports Bartholomae's point of view. Thus e. g. in Sogdian we find the form *š'w* 'black' which seems to justify the intermediate grade *š-* conjectured by Bartholomae. Of course, even in this case, the utmost one is ready to admit is that the first part of the supposed process *si-* > *š-* > *s-* was accomplished in Proto-Iranian, while the second part was a development in individual languages. But the Iranian names in the inscriptions of South Russia have established it beyond doubt that Bartholomae's suggestion is untenable even in this form. Among these names we find the following forms: *Σαυάγοις* Panticapaeum, *Σιάουος* Olbia, *Σιαύαχος* Tanais⁶³. These names which date from the second century A. D. reflect the forms *syāv*, *syāvay*, *syāvak*⁶⁴. This makes it clear that the language of some of the Iranian tribes in South Russia retained the initial group of phonemes *si-* until late historical times; actually, even in the late Middle Ages, the word *syāv* was taken over from Ossetian in the form *šau* by the Balkars⁶⁵. Thus, these Iranian linguistic data from South Russia show clearly, together with Avestan *syāva-* and Modern Persian *siyāh*, that even the first part of the phonemic change *si-* > *š-* > *s-* cannot be regarded as going back to Proto-Iranian times.

Another important point in Bartholomae's Proto-Iranian reconstruction was the thesis that Aryan palatal *k-* developed into *š-* before *i*, and that this group of phonemes *ši-* was simplified to *š-*; see e. g. Avestan *šava'tiē* ~ Old Indian *cyavati*, Avestan *šā* ~ Modern Persian *šād*, etc⁶⁶. The Sogdian data do not contradict this conjecture; see. e. g. *šw-* 'gehen'. In Ossetian, however, there is a very interesting correspondence to the Proto-Iranian conjectural initial group of phonemes *ši-*: Avestan *šava'tiē* ~ Ossetian *cāuən*, Avestan *šā'ti-* ~ Ossetian *āncad*. Thus in Ossetian we find *c-* instead of *s* to be expected, or, more precisely, in Western and Eastern Ossetian we find *c-*, while in the Javian dialect of Southern Ossetian, we find *č-* or *š-*⁶⁷. According to Abaev's suggestion, however, it is not the Old Iranian palatal affricate that has been preserved in the phoneme *č-* of the Javian dialect (actually, such a conjecture was not put forward, as even in Bartholomae's view the Aryan *k-* had developed, already in Proto-Iranian, into *š-* if followed by *i*), but the development of this phoneme is a secondary phenomenon⁶⁸.

We will disregard, for the time being, the first part of this suggestion, viz. the question of the phoneme corresponding in Old or Proto-Iranian to present Javian *č-*, and will discuss the second part. There are several serious objections to regarding the phoneme *č-*, in the Javian dialect, as a secondary phenomenon. First of all, Abaev himself points out that, according to Yalguzidse's data, deriving from 1802, the phoneme *č-* was still extant at that time in the Javian dialect, though to-day it

⁶² *Grundriß der iranischen Philologie*, I 1, 37.

⁶³ See Vasmer, *Die Iranier in Südrussland*, 51 foll.

⁶⁴ See also Schaefer, *Iranica*, Berlin 1934, 51.

⁶⁵ See Miller, *Die Sprache der Osseten*, 4. Cp. also Georgian *šav-i* < Ossetian **šau*.

⁶⁶ *Grundriß der iranischen Philologie*, I. 1, 7, 38, Reichelt, *Awestisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg 1909, 45.

⁶⁷ With regard to South Ossetian see Абаев, О языке южных осетин, 89.

⁶⁸ О языке южных осетин, 97.

has already been replaced by the palatal spirant \dot{s} .⁶⁹ If we were to accept Abaev's theory of the Javian \dot{c} - being a secondary phenomenon, we would have to regard the palatal spirant \dot{s} - as its predecessor, a phoneme which is actually found in most Iranian languages. In this case, however, phonemic development would run along the line \dot{s} - > \dot{c} - > \dot{s} - which does not seem probable at all. Moreover, one must not examine the Javian dialect by itself, in complete isolation. According to Yalguzi-dze's data, around 1800 the phoneme \dot{c} - was still pronounced in Javian, instead of the c - in the western and northern dialects. There is no doubt, however, that in the latter dialects, too, the phoneme c - had developed from an earlier \dot{c} -. This is shown by the fact that in the place-names of the territory once inhabited by Ossetes, present Western and Eastern Ossetian c - is represented by \dot{c} -; see e. g. *šaufčik* = Ossetian *sau-āfcäg* 'Schwarzer Paß'⁷⁰. According to Munkácsi's notes, this latter word has the following phonemic forms in the various Ossetian dialects: Eastern Ossetian *āfcäg*, Southern Ossetian *āfsäg*, *āfsäk*, Western Ossetian *āfcäk* 'zur Sommerweide geeignete bergige Gegend'⁷¹.

Since, according to the testimony of place-names, the Western and Eastern Ossetian c - goes back to an earlier \dot{c} -, and since in Southern Ossetian they still pronounced \dot{c} -, instead of the present \dot{s} -, it is clear that the Javian \dot{c} cannot be secondary, unless the phoneme \dot{c} -, which had originally existed in the phonemic system of Ossetian, was a secondary development in the rest of the Ossetian dialects, too, i. e. in the whole of the Ossetian linguistic territory. But such a supposition lacks any foundation, because in Ossetian the palatal spirant \dot{s} -, whether old or of secondary origin, has been equally replaced by the dental spirant s -. Consequently, if the predecessor of the present Eastern and Western Ossetian c - ~ Javian \dot{c} - > \dot{s} - had been \dot{s} - or \dot{s}_i - (whether in Proto- or Old Iranian, or at any other period) we would find to-day the phoneme s - in its place. Thus we have to regard it as certain that the predecessor of present Ossetian c - ~ \dot{c} - > \dot{s} - was \dot{c} - both in Old Iranian and in Proto-Iranian. This fact has a double consequence for the reconstruction of Proto-Iranian. First, it is impossible to prove that the group of phonemes \dot{s}_i - has already developed in Proto-Iranian into \dot{s} -. Secondly, the thesis that the Aryan palatal k -, if followed by i -, developed into \dot{s} -, in Proto-Iranian, is also refuted. Ossetian offers clear testimony to the effect that the Aryan palatal k might develop into \dot{c} - in some Proto-Iranian languages, even if followed by i .

3. The Sarmatian Dialects of the North Pontic Region

Thus, in examining the Iranian names preserved in the Greek inscriptions of South Russia, we have to clear up the question as to whether these names really reflect a homogeneous language, and whether this language may really be regarded as the predecessor of Ossetian. The question is, what criteria have we to employ in attempting to solve this problem. Miller's proofs, as we have seen above, are partly of phonemic, partly of morphological character. As to the two morphological proofs, i. e. the presence of the suffix *-äg* and *-gin* in the names of the inscriptions, undue importance need not be attached to them. Miller himself has pointed out that the suffix *-äg* is found also in Persian, in Baluchi, and in Afghan.⁷² One may

⁶⁹ О языке южных осетин, 89.

⁷⁰ See Миллер, Осетинские этюды. III, 8, *Die Sprache der Osseten*, 5.

⁷¹ KSz XX (1923—1927), 63.

⁷² *Die Sprache der Osseten*, 89.

add that it has since been discovered in Sogdian, too; cp. *e. g.* *šm'r'k* 'qui a des scrupules, qui hésite', from the verb *šm'r-*; *np'yš'k* 'qui écrit' from the verb *np'yš-*, etc.⁷³ The same applies also to the suffix *-gin*, equivalents of which have been found by Benveniste in Persian and Sogdian.⁷⁴ Thus these morphological elements cannot be utilized to prove the existence of nearer genealogical connections between the language of the Iranian tribes in South Russia and Ossetian. In order to clarify the relation between the Iranian names in the Pontic Greek inscriptions and Ossetian, we shall have to rely on phonemic criteria. This implies, no doubt, a certain degree of one-sidedness; but this one-sidedness is the direct consequence of the linguistic material at our disposal. Moreover, if we have to count with the existence of several dialects among the Iranian tribes of South Russia, these differences may be best determined on the basis of phonemic criteria. The differences might become even sharper if we were able to define the phonemic system of the languages or dialects used by the various Iranian tribes of South Russia; but the one-sided linguistic material, preserved only in Greek transcription, does not make this feasible. Hence in the rest of this essay we shall have to limit ourselves to the demonstration and systematization of phonemic differences.⁷⁵

If we examine the Iranian names preserved in Greek inscriptions as well as the Sarmatian names figuring in the works of classical antiquity, we shall find that names dating from roughly the same period show different developments for certain Old Iranian phonemes or groups of phonemes. This fact is of outstanding importance since the most obvious explanation of the phenomenon is that names, showing different lines of phonemic development but dating from the same period, derive from different dialects. This, in turn, leads us to the conclusion that the Iranian (Sarmatian) tribes in South Russia spoke dialects or languages more or less different from one another. These languages and dialects were, of course, possibly more closely connected among themselves than with any other Iranian language. The most characteristic cases of this type are the following:

1.

The Old Iranian initial group of phonemes **ar-y-* has four different developments: 1. *ar-(y)-*, 2. *al-*, 3. *ir-*, 4. *il-*.

Old Iranian **ar-y-* > *ar-(y)-*.

Arii 'name of a tribe in South Russia' in Epiphanius (4th cent. A. D.), *De lapid^e ligyrio* V. IV, p. 190 Dind. (Латышев, Известия древних писателей, I. 712): < Old Iranian **arya-* ~ Avestan *airya-* (Vasmer, *Die Iranier in Südrussland*, 33).

Arraei Sarmatae, quos *Areatas* vocant: Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* IV 41 (1st c. A. D.). Thus Pliny gives two names for this Sarmatian tribe living south of the Danube. In the ending of the second name we recognize the plural suffix *-t*, *-tä*, found also in Ossetian, Sogdian, and Yagnobi. The remaining first part of the name (*Area-*) may be compared again with the Old Iranian name **arya-*. The difference that appears in the second syllable of the two forms (*-ea-* ~ *-ya-*) may be explained in two different ways. First, taking into consideration the fact that in the transmission of Pliny's text the names of peoples are to a varying degree, and sometimes hopelessly, corrupt,

⁷³ See Benveniste, *Essai de grammaire sogdienne*, II, 55.

⁷⁴ *Essai de grammaire sogdienne*, II, 97.

⁷⁵ On the classification of dialects see Gy. Laziczius, *A magyar nyelvújások*, Budapest 1936, 44 foll. For the criticism of earlier methods see Шор-Чемоданов, Введение в языковедение, 228 foll.

we may easily suppose that *Area-tas* is a corruption of an earlier form **Aria-tas*. This form would correspond precisely to a possible Sarmatian form **arya-ta*. The second, more likely possibility is that the spelling *Area-* reflects a form *arēa-* which is simply a variation of the word *arya-*. There is a parallel among the names preserved in the inscriptions: the name *Σαύαζος* known from two inscriptions of Tanais, the nearest possible transcription, in Greek letters, of an Iranian form *syāvak* (~ Avestan *syāva-* 'schwarz') appears in the variation *Σαύαχος* in an inscription of Panticapaeum (see Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 51 foll., Schaefer, *Iranica*, 51). This latter datum makes it clear that the spelling *Area-* may be also a transcription of the word *arya-* or one of its variations (? *arāya-* or *arēa-*). If we take into consideration that the form *Areatas* contains an Iranian morphological element (the plural suffix *-t*), it seems very likely that this name was used by the Sarmatian tribe in question, to denote itself. It is possible that this name is somehow connected with the one discussed above. The most natural assumption would be that this, in its turn, is a Latinized (or, if Pliny took his datum from a Greek source, Grecized) form of the word *arya-*. In this case, however, we must regard it as a corruption of the form **Arii* or **Arei*. To show that such a distortion might easily occur in the transmission of Pliny's text, it is enough to quote the manuscript variants of the name *Pangaei*: *pangaei*, *pangei*, *paegiae*, *pegei*, *peie*.

**Αριφάρνης ὁ τῶν Θαπέων βασιλεὺς* Diod. Sic. XX: 22, 4 < **arya-farnah* (Vasmer, *loc. cit.*).

Old Iranian **ar-y-* > *al-*.

**Αλανοί* 'Iranian tribe of Southern Russia' Flav. Joseph. VII 7, 4. The name of the Alans is known from other sources, too: e. g. Chinese sources: *A-lan* (Hou-Han-shu, 118, Wei-lüe, fragm. 22, see Junge, *Saka-Studien*, 77); Latin authors: *Alani* and *Halani*; Arabic and Persian sources: *al-Lān*; recently the name has been discovered also in Mingrel, one of the Caucasian languages: *alan-kod̥i* 'человек-алан, т. е. сильный, храбрый, молодец' (see Абаев, ИАН СССР ООИ 1935, 883). All data in the sources point to the form *alan*. The name *alan* admits of two acceptable interpretations. According to Andreas (cf. H. Jacobsohn, *Arier und Ugrofinnen*, 234) and Sköld (*Die ossetischen Lehnwörter im Ungarischen*, 68) it goes back to the plural genitive form *aryānām* of the Old Iranian word *arya-*; hence, morphologically, it is ultimately identical with the Persian name *Ērān*, *Īrān*. According to the other interpretation, also the name *alan* goes back to the Old Iranian word *arya-* 'Arier' (more correctly, perhaps, to *ārya-*, see Tedesco, *ZII* II (1923) 46); not, however, to the genitive plural but to the form *āryāna-* formed with the suffix *-na-*. From the angle of phonetics, assuming the development *-ry-* > *-l-*,⁷⁶ both interpretations are irreproachable; yet, owing to semantic considerations, the second explanation must be preferred. The name *Ērān*, *Īrān* is the name of a country and probably developed from the construction *āryānām xšaθram* > *ērān šahr* 'das Reich der Arier'. All our data, however, which refer to the name *alan* (with the exception of the Chinese sources; the testimony of which, in this respect, is by no means decisive) agree in indicating that this name was the name of a people. The word *ārya-* and its derivation *āryāna-* were used to denote a tribe or a tribal federation. An enlightening parallel to this use may be found in the tribal names discussed above (*Arii* and *Arraei* ~ *Areatae*) as well as in the name the Eastern Ossetes use about themselves, viz. the name *ir* 'Ironer (Ostosseten)' which may also be traced back to the Old Iranian form

⁷⁶ Andreas, quoted by Gauthiot, *Essai de grammaire sogdienne*, I, III; Jacobsohn, *Arier und Ugrofinnen*, 234.

ārya-. The form *āryāna-* itself is found in the Avesta: *airyana-* 'arisch', *airyanəm xvarənō*, *airyanəm vaējō* (Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 198). Recently, the form *āryāna-* has also been traced in Sogdian in the construction *āryānām vaijah*: 'ry'nwɣjn ɔ: *aryān vēžan* (see Henning, *ZDMG* XC [1936], 5). Since, however, the above word does not occur otherwise in Sogdian, we may possibly have to do with a borrowing from Persian in this case. We have to point out, however, that none of these data testifying to the existence of the word *āryāna-* are used to denote the name of a people, or the name of a definite tribe. For this reason, from the angle of deriving the word *alan* as the name of a people from the form **āryāna-*, decisive importance attaches to the fact that in Ossetian we actually find the word *ārya-*, with the suffix *-na-* appended, used to denote an ethnical unit: *iron* 'Ironer (Ost-Ossete), ost-ossetisch' < Old Iranian **āryāna-*.

The derivation of the name *alan* from the form **āryāna-* was earlier regarded with some scepticism by Vasmer;⁷⁷ later, however, he came to accept this interpretation⁷⁸. In the eyes of those advocating the identity of Alans and Ossetes, the most surprising feature in this derivation of the name *alan* from the form *āryāna-*, was the need to suppose the presence of the phonetic change *-ry- > -l-*, a change that cannot be shown to have taken place in Ossetian. In Ossetian the Old Iranian initial group of phonemes **āry-* does not develop into *al-*, as one would expect on the basis of the name *alan* and the supposed identity of Alans and Ossetes: it develops into *īr-* or *īr-* (cf. Eastern Ossetian *īr* 'Ironer (Ostosseten)' Western Ossetian *īrā* 'осетинская порода, осет. народ' see Munkácsi, *KSz* XXI (1932), 86, < Old Iranian **ārya-*; Eastern Ossetian *iron* 'Ironer (Ost-Ossete), ost-ossetisch' < Old Iranian **āryāna-*⁷⁹). Hence the name *Ἀλανοί* can in no wise be regarded as Ossetian because its phonemic form cannot be brought into line with the phonemic correspondences between Old Iranian and Ossetian. Nor does the situation change if we reject the view discussed above, and suppose that the name *Ἀλανοί* goes back only indirectly to **arya-na*⁸⁰, because, even assuming this, we cannot explain the presence of the initial *a-* from Ossetian. The fact that the name *Alan* cannot be interpreted from Ossetian has a decisive importance on our judgment about the relations of Alans and Ossetes. It would be an obvious assumption, of course, that the name *Alan* was not applied by the Alans to themselves. This possibility, to which there can be no objection in principle, is, however, excluded by the fact that the change *-ry- > -l-* may be demonstrated also in the case of another name, precisely on the linguistic territory of the Alans (see the following item).

Ἀλέξανδρος Phanagoria, Latyshev, *IOSPE* II, 363 (307 A. D.): Vasmer, in *Die Iranier in Südrussland*, 31 explains this form as deriving from Old Iranian **arya-χšaθra-* through dissimilation, in *RLV* XII 224 as deriving from the same form, through popular etymology, under the influence of *Ἀλέξανδρος*. But the names of the inscriptions do not furnish any examples for such dissimilation (cp. *Ἀριαράθης*, *Ἀριαράμνης* Vasmer, *Die Iranier in Südrussland*, 33); as to connecting this word with the Greek name *Ἀλέξανδρος*, by way of popular etymology, this could have occurred only after the change *ary- > al-* had taken place: hence it seems certain that, as in the case of the people's name *Ἀλανοί*, here, too, we have to do with the change *ary- > al-*, having the force of a phonetic law. Old Iranian **arya-χšaθra-* developed into **ala-χsarθ* and this form may have turned, being connected in popular etymology

⁷⁷ *Die Iranier in Südrussland*, 31.

⁷⁸ *RLV* XII, 242.

⁷⁹ Hübschmann, *Etymologie und Lautlehre der ossetischen Sprache*, 41.

⁸⁰ Vasmer, *loc. cit.*

with the Greek word ἄλεξω or Ἀλέξανδρος into Ἀλέξανθος. Another possibility is that the form Ἀλέξανθος does not owe anything to Greek popular etymology but simply reflects a form *alāxsarθ. One is justified in supposing the existence of such a form, on the analogy of parallel forms like Καινάξανθος < Old Iranian *kainaxšaθra- and Κηνέξανθος σ: kēnāxsarθ.

Μάλδαγος Phanagoria, Latyshev, *IOSPE* II, 389. If this, in fact, is the correct form of the name (it does not seem quite certain), then the word reflects an Iranian form *malday* which, in turn, may have developed from an Old Iranian form *marya-taka-, under the operation of the change -ry- > -l-. The element *marya-* in this word may be regarded as the exact equivalent of the Old Indian word *marya-* 'Jüngling, flötter junger Mann', while the second part *-taka-* may stand for a group of suffixes. This latter can probably be divided into the elements -(a)t-a-ka-. With regard to the suffix *-at-*, *-t-*, cp. Avestan *brvat-* 'Augenbraue' ~ Old Indian *bhrū-* 'Augenbraue' and Avestan *hu-zāmit-* 'leicht gebärend' ~ Avestan *hu-zāmay-* 'leichte Geburt' (H. Reichelt, *Awestisches Elementarbuch*, 152); as to the juxtaposition of the suffixes *-t-* and *-t-a-*, cp. Old. Indian *harit-* 'falb' ~ *harita-* 'gelb, grün', from the word *haray-* 'gelb, falb', and the corresponding juxtaposition of the suffixes *-it-* and *-ita-* in Old Iranian, e. g. Avestan *masit-* 'ausgedehnt, groß' ~ *masita-* 'groß, umfangreich', from the word *mas-* 'lang, ausgedehnt, groß'. As to the suffix *-ka-*, this is one of the most frequent elements of word-formation in the Iranian languages, occurring very often also in combination with numerous other suffixes. It appears e. g. in Sogdian in the following groups of suffixes: -(')n'k < *-(a)-na-ka-, -'nyk < *-anayaka-, -'y'k < *-aiyaka-, -'yk < *-ayaka-, -'yn'k < *ainaka-, etc. (see Benveniste, *Essai de grammaire sogdienne*, II, 95 foll.). The situation is precisely the same in the Saka language. Here, too, the suffix *-ka-* is very frequent ("sehr verbreitet und bis in die Spätzeit lebendig" — says Konow in his *Khotansakische Grammatik*, 67), and is used also in combination with several other suffixes; see e. g. *-naa-* < *-naka-, *-laka-*, *-lika-*, etc. (Konow, *op. cit.*, 68, 70). Traces of the group of suffixes *-taka-* are found, too, in one or two Ossetian words. Thus, the word *säftäg* 'Klaue, Huf' which is connected with the Avestan word *safa-* 'Huf' (see Miller, *Die Sprache der Osseten*, 94), goes back undoubtedly to an Old Iranian form *safa-taka- and contains the compound suffix *-taka-* supposed to be present in the name *Malday* < *Marya-taka-. Thus the derivation of the name Μάλδαγος from the Old Iranian form *marya-taka- becomes very probable, and if the restoration of the name proves to be correct, it supplies another example of the phonetic change -ry- > -l-.

Old Iranian *ar-y- > ir-.

Ἰρακᾶς ἀρχιεργμηνεύς Ἀλανῶν, Panticapaeum (193—208 A. D.). The name, certainly has to be read as *irak-* because, on inscriptions dating from the same period we often find η instead of ι: < Old Iranian *arya-ka- (Vasmer, *Die Iranier in Südrußland*, 39 foll., *Iranisches aus Südrußland*, 368).

Ἰρβις Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 195 (188 A. D.). This name was regarded by Miller as a compound of the Ossetian words *ir* and *vidag* (*ir* 'Ironer (Ostoseten)' > *ārya-; *vidag*, Munkácsi: *KSz* XXI (1932), 83: *uidag*, *ui^edagā* 'Wurzel', the approximate sense of the whole name being 'von arischer Wurzel'); Vasmer was right, however, in pointing out that the earlier meaning of the word *vidag* was probably 'Weide' (cp. e. g. Avestan *vaētay-* 'Weide, Weidengerte', and that with this meaning the name does not give any acceptable sense (Vasmer, *Die Iranier in Südrußland*, 41). With regard to Ἰρ-, the first element in the name, Miller's interpretation may be accepted in any case. As to the second element -βις (stem: βιδ-), there are two

possible explanations: 1. ~ Avestan *vaēdah-* 'Besitz', 2. ~ Avestan *vaēday-* 'Gestalt, Form'. In the first case the Old Iranian form of the name would be **ārya-vaidah-*, meaning 'der den Besitz der Arier ergriffen hat', or 'der einem Arier gebührenden Besitz hat'; in the second case, we may assume the existence of an Old Iranian form **ārya-vaiday-*, meaning 'of Aryan form'. Whichever interpretation we accept, the name *Ἰρβίς* shows the development of the initial group of phonemes *ary-* into *ir-*.

Ἰργαυός Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 196 (beginning of third c. A. D.). This name, hitherto unexplained, may be traced back to an Old Iranian form **āryakāna-*, i.e. the word *ārya-* supplied with the well-known patronymic suffix *-(a)kāna-* > *-(a)yān* (see e.g. Armenian *Boyekan* < Middle Persian *Bōi* + *akān* Hübschmann, *Armenische Grammatik*, I, Leipzig 1895, 33, Middle Persian *'rdw'ng'n ɔ: ardawānāyān* 'Ardawānian, deriving from Ardawān, etc.). Thus the meaning of the name *iryān* may have been 'deriving from Aryan' or 'deriving from Ir' (= an ancestor bearing the name of *ir* < *ārya-*). The assumption of the latter meaning is obvious, on the basis of names like *Ἰραχᾶς* < *īrak*, *Φορήραυος* < *furīran*, etc.

Ἰράμβουστος Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 195 (188 A. D.): the first element in the name goes back to Old Iranian **āryana-* or **ārya-* (cp. *Ἰραμβουστος* Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 31).

Ἰραυᾶδις Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 194 (225 A. D.): *Ἰρ-* < *ārya-* (Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 41, *Iranisches aus Südrussland*, 368).

Φορήραυος Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 386 (225 and 212—229 A. D.) < Old Iranian **paru-āryana-* 'viele Arier beherrschend' (Vasmer, *Die Iranier in Südrussland*, 55, *RLV XII*, 245).

Old Iranian **ar-y-* > *il-*.

Ἡλμανος Olbia, Vasmer, *Die Iranier in Südrussland*, 39. This name, hitherto unexplained, probably goes back, assuming the development **ar-y-* > *il-*, to an Old Iranian form **aryaman-* which may be compared with Avestan *airyaman-* 'Genosse' ~ Old Indian *aryaman-* 1. 'Genosse', 2. 'Name eines *Āditya*' (see on this point Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 198 foll., Benveniste: *JA CCXXI* (1932), 124 foll.) as well as with Middle Persian *ērmān* and Modern Persian *īrmān* 'Gast' (with regard to the latter see Horn, *Grundriß der neupersischen Etymologie*, Strassburg 1893, 32 foll. and Hübschmann, *Persische Studien*, Straßburg 1895, 20 foll.).

Names like *Ἰράμβουστος*, *Ἰραχᾶς*, etc. indicate that we have to do here with an *i*-epenthesis; so the line of development is *ir-* < **air-* < **ary-*. The other two groups of names show, however, that this development was not general, but was restricted to a definite dialect or group of dialects. Thus one cannot derive, for instance, the element *Ἀλε-* in the name *Ἀλέξανδρος* from the Iranian form **airya-*, as Vasmer did, (*RLV XII*, 244), because the regular development of this form is *ir-* or *il-*. This would be all the less justified as the *i-* and *u-*epenthesis can be shown to have existed, among the Old Iranian languages, only in the Avesta⁸¹, and even here it is probably due only to the carelessness of Persian and Parthian scribes⁸². There can be no question of an *i-* or *u-*epenthesis common to all Iranian languages or going back to Proto-Iranian. On the other hand, the testimony of these names indicates that

⁸¹ Bartholomae, *Grd. d. i. Ph.* I, 176.

⁸² Reichelt, *Stand und Aufgaben der Sprachwissenschaft*, 278. This view is represented by Bartholomae and his followers. A fundamentally different approach is seen in Andreas and his school, recently also in Bailey's theory (*Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth-Century Books*, Oxford 1943, 17 foll.). Neither theory does however, envisage epenthesis in Common or Proto-Iranian. For a recent view on the whole subject see Altheim, *Literatur und Gesellschaft im ausgehenden Altertum*, II, 189 foll.

epenthesis must have been a fairly early phenomenon in some of the dialects and the existence of such dialects must, in fact, be assumed. Accordingly, one may actually suppose that the phenomenon did, in fact, exist in the language of the Avesta, in the first centuries A. D., as Reichelt (*loc. cit.*) assumes on other grounds. In any case, the dialect which supplies us with these names is connected, by means of this phenomenon, with those Northern and Eastern Iranian dialects in which the *i*-epenthesis can be shown to have existed: Saka *ysiḍaa-* < **zaritaka-*, Afghan *šil* ~ Avestan *visaiti*, Ossetian *innä* < **anya-*, Shughni. *nir* < **narya*.⁸³

2.

The Old Iranian diphthong *au* developed along two lines: 1. *au* (αο). 2. *ō* (ω).

Old Iranian **au* > *au*.

"*Αορσοι* 'Sarmatian tribe'. This name has been interpreted in different ways. Jacobsohn thought that the word *āryana-* was somehow concealed behind it; later, however, he gave up this conjecture (*Arier und Ugrofinnen*, 234, 257). Miller (ЖМНПр 1886 October 235 — article inaccessible to me) and Tomaschek (*SWAW* CXVII [1888], 37, *PWRE* I, 2660) connected the name "*Αορσοι* eith Avestan *auruša-* 'weiß', Ossetian *ors*, *ūrs* 'weiß'; this interpretation was later accepted by Vasmer (*Die Iranier in Südrußland*, 32) and Altheim, too (*WaG* II [1936], 319).

Against this interpretation Marquart has tried to explain the name in a new way. The starting point of his new interpretation was the existence of historical contacts between Alans and Aorsi. According to the testimony of Chinese sources, *Yen-ts'ai* whom Marquart, following Gutschmid and Hirth, identifies with the "*Αορσοι*", changed his name to *A-lan*. Since, however, Greek and Latin sources inform us that in Eastern Europe the name Aorsi was replaced by Alan, Marquart comes to the conclusion that the name "*Αορσοι* is but the earlier name of the Alans. He now attempts to establish the meaning of the name Alan, calling to aid the series of epithets applied to an Armenian nobleman's family in Faustus Byz. (4, 2): *alanazgik'*, *alana-drawšk'* *arcowēnšank'* *waržnakanišk'*. The last of these four epithets, in Marquart's view, goes back to an adjective **waržnak* which may be a borrowing of a Middle Persian form **waržānak* or **waržēnak* (derived from Middle Persian *warž*, Modern Persian *warj* 'Größe, Würde'): hence the meaning of the word is 'würdig'. The expression *arcowēnšank'* is purely Armenian, with the meaning 'Adlerstandarten führend'. The second element in the first epithet is the Armenian word *azg* 'Geschlecht, Nation', hence the compound probably means 'aus alanischem Geschlecht stammend'. Finally the second element in the second epithet is the Armenian word *drawš* (<Iranian *drafš*) 'Banner', so that the meaning of the compound is 'alanische Banner führend'.

Since thus all the epithets express worth and dignity and are closely related in meaning, Marquart was justified in concluding that the word *alan*, i. e. the initial element in the first two epithets must mean 'siegreich, ruhmvoll, würdig'. Hence, according to him, "der Volksname *Alanen* wird demnach ein Ehrenname sein, den sich das Volk selbst beilegte und der eine Gruppe verschiedenartiger iranischer Nomadenstämme der kaspisch-pontischen Steppen zu einer politischen Einheit zusammenfaßte".

Regarding the word "*Αορσοι* as the former name of the Alans, Marquart then

⁸³ With regard to these dialects see Reichelt, *loc. cit.* and *Grdr. d. idg. Sprach- und Altertums-kunde*, II, 4^o, 33.

proceeds to look for a similar meaning behind it. For the purposes of interpretation he distinguishes, first of all, two forms of the name: 1. *Arsoae* (Tab. Peut. IX 5, X 1), **Arzoae* (*Abzoae*: Pliny, Nat. Hist. 6, 38) — 2. **Aopsoi* (Strabo, Ptolemy), *Aorsi* (Pliny Nat. Hist. 4, 80). Of these, Marquart derives the form *Arsoae*, *Arzoae* from the Iranian form **arž-awa-* (cf. Modern Persian *arj* 'Wert', Avestan *arājah-*, Middle Persian *arj*, etc.); as to the form **Aopsoi*, *Aorsi*, he interprets it as the Iranian compound **hu-arž-* (with the approximate meaning 'guten Wert habend?'). Thus Marquart concludes that "der Name Aorser, ebenso wie die Alanen, eine ehrenvolle Selbstbezeichnung ist, welche sich das Volk bzw. der führende Stamm wahrscheinlich bei der Begründung einer größeren politischen Einheit beilegte" (*Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran*, II, 82—86.)

Marquart's explanation is, both historically and linguistically, so well-grounded that one cannot simply pass it by. The first question in this connection is whether we really have to do with two forms of the name. In support of his conjecture, Marquart refers to the parallel forms *Su-gambri* ~ *Gambrivii* and *Wisi-gothae* ~ *Gutones*. But these parallels only demonstrate, in a general way, the possibility of a tribe or a people having two names, differing only in an element implying comparison. The question whether this applies also to the name **Aopsoi* can be decided only after a careful investigation of the data containing the name.

An examination of the ancient sources referring to the name **Aopsoi* yields the following result: of the two forms, separated by Marquart, it is only the **Aopsoi*, *Aorsi* that can be substantiated by sound textual tradition. Textual tradition supports unanimously the form **Aopsoi* in Strabo and Ptolemy, and nearly unanimously the form *Aorsi* in Pliny (Nat. Hist. 4, 80). In the case of Tacitus (Ann. XII 15, 16 and 19), the MSS give the forms *adorsorum*, *adorsi*, and *aduorsorum*. These forms are obviously due to the circumstance that the scribes wanted to impart some meaning to a name unintelligible to them. But these particular forms of 'rationalization' may all be traced back to the form *Aorsi*, not to *Arsoae*. Thus the data in Tacitus, too, are organically connected with the form **Aopsoi*, *Aorsi*.

As to the other form distinguished by Marquart, we have to point out, first of all, that the Plinian form *Arzoae* is only Tomaschek's conjecture: the MSS give *Abzoae* which is probably a corruption — yet there is no material proof whatever to show that the name *Aorsi* is hiding behind it. Hence this conjecture may be left out of account. But if this is so, the forms *Arsoae* in the Tabula Peut., by themselves, do not possess any special significance. The Tabula is full of corrupt forms, so that it would be contrary to all rules of scientific methods if one were to regard the form *Arsoae* as authentic as the forms **Aopsoi*, *Aorsi* found in Strabo, Ptolemy, Pliny, and Tacitus. Moreover, judging from the character of textual corruption due to the copying of MSS, one may demonstrate almost palpably the corrupt nature of the form *Arsoae* as well as the causes of its origin. The deviation in the endings of the two forms *Arsoae* and *Aorsi* may be easily explained by the supposition that, parallel with the Latinized form *Aorsi* of the name **Aopsoi*, the geographical literature of the Romans also used the form *Aorsoe*, a transcription of the Greek name.

There are plenty of examples in Roman authors for such parallel usage in names taken over from Greek geographical literature. Thus, e. g., the name *Νευποι* appears in Mela (II, 1) as *Neuri*, while in Pliny we find the form *Neuroe* (Nat. Hist. 4, 88); conversely, the name *Ἀμαξόβιοι* is transcribed by Mela (II, 1) as *Hamaxobioe*, by Pliny (Nat. Hist. 4, 80) as *Hamaxobii*; similarly, the name *Ἀριμασποί* occurs in Mela (II, 1) as *Arimaspoie*, while in Pliny (Nat. Hist. 4, 88) we find *Arimaspi*. It may be observed that such un-Latinized names, transcribed from Greek, often have their

ending *-oe* distorted, or rather Latinized, to *-oae* in the course of *MS* transmission. Thus, e. g., in some *MSS* of Pliny the name *Enoecadioe* (Nat. Hist. 4, 83) appears as *enocadloae*, *enoae.adioae*. In the latter form both Greek diphthongs *-oe-* have been 'corrected' to *-oae-* by the copyist. Similarly, some *MSS* of Pliny give the form *neuroae* for the name *Neuroe* (Nat. Hist. 4, 88). Thus the ending of the form *Arsoae* in the Tabula Peut., may be easily explained as the result of a secondary Latinization of the name *Aorsoe*. As to the deviation in the initial sounds of the word (*Aor-* ~ *Ar-*), the omission of one of two juxtaposed vowels is a frequent phenomenon in the transmission of *MSS*. Thus the name of the people given by Mela as *Choamani* is found in several of Pliny's *MSS* as *comani* (Nat. Hist. 6, 48). Another example from the transmission of Pliny's text is the distortion of the word *Bactros* (Nat. Hist. 6, 47), first, to *baotros*, then its further corruption to *botros*. On the basis of these examples we are justified in taking it practically for granted that the form found in the Tabula Peut., is a distorted form of the Latin transcription of the name *Ἀορσοί*. The process of its origin may be outlined as follows: **Aorsoe* > **Arsoae* > *Arsoae*.

Thus the thesis which forms the base of Marquart's edifice of explanations — viz. the existence of two forms for the name of the Aorsi — has proved to be unacceptable. The other fundamental question which has to be posed in connection with Marquart's theory, is whether the name *Ἀορσοί* may, in fact, represent the transcription of an Iranian form **hu-arž-*. Since the Greek letter *o* stood for a definitely close *o*-sound (= *o*) it is most probable that the name *Ἀορσοί* represented a foreign form **aurs*. Such a form is, of course, very far from Marquart's **hu-arž-*, the Greek transcription of which would be **Ὠαρζοί* or **Χόαρζοί*. Marquart himself was aware of the grave difficulties which arise in this connection: hence he gave several parallels to illustrate the possibility of transcribing as *Ἀορσοί* the conjectural form **hu-arž-*. His examples are as follows:

Ἀορνος < Iranian **hu-warna-*, 'wohlbewehrt', from the stem *war-* 'wehren'.

Ἀοσσα = Avestan *hutaosā-* 'EN der Schwester und Gemahlin *Vištāspas*'.

Ἀμώρριοι, *Ἀμόρρης*, Lycian *Humrkkā* = Old Persian *haumavarga-*.

Finally, Marquart quotes several names beginning with *Ἀυτο-*, in which the first element represents Old Persian **wāta-*; e. g. *Ἀυτοφραδάτης* = Old Persian *wātafraḍāta-*.

But these examples are either not suitable parallels to the transcription of Iranian **hu-arž-* as Greek *Ἀορσοί* or have to be interpreted in a way different from Marquart's.

The name *Ἀορνος* is certainly not the transcription of an Old Iranian form **huvarna-*: it may either stand for **urn*, a conjectural development of this form; or it may be connected (as Tomaschek suggested in *PW-RE* I, 2659) with a quite different word, viz. Old Iranian *āvarana-* 'Schutzwehr', the existence of which may be conjectured on the basis of Old Indian *āvaraṇa-* 'verhüllend; Verhüllung, Hülle, Decke, Gewand': in this case the Greek form would transcribe the development **āurn*.

The name *Ἀοσσα* may also represent the transcription of **atōs*, a later development from Old Iranian **hutaosā-*.

Greek *Ἀμώρριοι*, *Ἀμόρρης* and Lycian *Humrkkā* reflect different developments of Old Iranian **haumavarga-*: 1. *Ἀμώρριοι*, *Ἀμόρρης* < **əmurgi*, **əmurg* < **haumavargah*; 2. *Humrkkā* < **hūmūrğa* < **haumavargah*.

From the angle of phonemics, the correspondence *Ἀυτοφραδάτης* ~ *Vātafraḍāta-* implies quite a different problem from that represented by *Ἀορσοί* ~ **hu-arž-*.

This is a case of the Greeks replacing a group of sounds (*va-*, *ya-*) absent from the phonemic system of their language, by another phoneme or group of phonemes (*av-*). Similar cases are very frequent in the Greek transcription of Iranian names (see e. g. Harmatta, *Ant. Hung.* II, 35).

We may thus establish that the Greek form of the name *Ἀορσοί* cannot represent the transcription of an Iranian form **hu-arž-*. The latter may have developed into **hvarž*, **xvarz*, **varz*, **xarz*, **xaz*: but all these are far from the foreign form **aurš*, the existence of which may be conjectured on the basis of the spelling *Ἀορσοί*. Thus the form **aurš* hiding behind the name can hardly be anything else but an intermediate stage in the following development: Old Iranian **aruša-* > **auruša-* > Ossetian *ors*, *urs*. We may also remark that the name *Ἀορσοί* shows *u*-epenthesis, a phenomenon which connects it with names like *Ἡρακλῆς*, etc. showing *i*-epenthesis.

Γάος Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 79 (225 A. D.). According to Vasmer, the word may be an abbreviated form of a person's name like Avestan *gaodāyah-* 'das Rind hegend und pflegend' or *gavayan-* 'der Rinder hat' (see *op. cit.* 36, RLV XII, 244). Since the group of phonemes *-ava-* is usually transcribed in the names of the inscriptions as *-av-* or as *-αυα-*, *-αυο-* (e. g. *Φορίανος*: *-αυο-* ~ Avestan *yava-* 'Getreide', Vasmer, *Die Iranier in Südrussland*, 55; G. *Σεάβατος* ~ Avestan *syāva-* 'schwarz', Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 51, etc.), probably only the first possibility has to be taken into account.

Old Iranian **au* > *ō*.

Ῥωξάνη Panticapaeum, Latyshev, *IOSPE* II, 107 ~ Avestan *raoxšna-* 'licht, glänzend' (Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 49).

Γώσακος Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 85 (220 A. D.). According to Vasmer (*op. cit.*, 37) this word has been obtained by suffixation from the short form of a name derived from **gōš*, the equivalent of the Avestan word *gaoša-* 'Ohr'. Besides Vasmer's conjecture there is also the possibility that this name has simply to be regarded as an equivalent of Old Persian **gaušaka-* 'Horcher', Parthian **gōšak* (> Armenian *gušak* 'Angeber, Denuntiant')⁸⁴.

Ἰώδας Panticapaeum, Latyshev, *IOSPE* II, 29: the word represents the short form of a name like Avestan *aspāyaoda-* (zu Rosse kämpfend' (Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 41). A similar name has recently been found in Sogdian: *ywδrzmk- o*: *yōdrzmag-* (see Reichelt, *Die soghdischen Handschriftenreste des Britischen Museums*, II, 56).

3.

The Old Iranian group of phonemes *-sp-* has three different developments: 1. *-sp-*, 2. *-fs-*, 3. *-sf-*.

Old Iranian **-sp-* > *-sp-*.

Ἀμώσπαδος Olbia, Latyshev, *IOSPE* I, 67 ~ Avestan *ama-* 'stark' + *spāda-* 'Heer' (Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 32).

Ἀσπακος Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 85 (220 A. D.). In Vasmer's view (*op. cit.*, 34) the word has been obtained by suffixation from the short form of a name formed from *aspa-* (like *aspačanah-*, *paruaspa-*).

Ἀσπαρ Procopius, *De bello Vandalico* I, 3, 8 < Old Iranian **aspabāra-* 'Reiter' (Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 34).

⁸⁴ With regard to these see Schaefer, *Iranica*, 5.

Βαϊόρασπος Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 68 (220 A. D.) < Old Iranian *baivaraspa-*, '10 000 (viele) Pferde habend' (Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 35).

Βανάδασπος 'King of the Iazyges' Dio Cass. 71, 16, 1: < Old Iranian **vanat-aspa-* 'siegreiche Pferde habend' (Vasmer, *loc. cit.*).

Βόρασπος Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 76 (193 A. D.): ~ Ossetian *bor* 'gelb', Modern Persian *bōr* 'color ruber' (Vull. I, 274) + *aspa-* (Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 36).

Σπαδάγας 'King of the Sanigae' Arrian. *Peripl.* 11, 3.

Σπάδακος Olbia, Latyshev, *IOSPE* I, 84: names formed from the Old Iranian word *spāda-* 'Heer', analogous to names derived by suffixation from the short forms of Avestan *pouruspāda-*, *srutōspāda-* (Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 52 foll.).

Old Iranian **-sp-* > *-fs-*.

Ψενδαρτάκη · λόφος ἐν Σκυθία μετὰ τὸ λεγόμενον ὄρος ἅγιον Steph Byz. According to Marquart's very probable conjecture the correct form of the name is **Ψενδαρτάκη*, to be explained as a compound of the words **fsānd* (~ Avestan *spānta-* 'heilig') and **art* (~ Avestan *ātar-* 'Feuer').⁸⁵ This view was accepted by Vasmer (*op. cit.*, 57 and *Iranisches aus Südrussland*, 371 foll.) who would, however, assign the change *sp* > *fs* to a period later than the third century A. D. and hence concludes that Stephanus Byzantius must have derived this datum from a later source. This view, however, is by no means probable. The sources used by Stephanus Byzantius are mostly geographical works dating from a period anterior to the second century A. D.,⁸⁶ hence there is a strong likelihood at the very outset that this particular datum comes from the same sources. Moreover, we can define more closely the origin of this particular datum. The phrase ἅγιον ὄρος cannot be separated from the place-name "Ἄγιον concerning which Stephanus supplies the following information: "Ἄγιον · τόπος Σκυθίας ἐν ᾧ Ἀσκληπιδὸς ἐτιμᾶτο, ὡς Πολύϊστωρ. Hence it seems indubitable that both data derive from Polyhistor⁸⁷. Since, however, Stephanus had no direct access to the work of Alexander Polyhistor⁸⁸, it would be an obvious assumption that the mediator, as in many other cases, was Philo of Byblus. But even in the absence of such a fairly precise delimitation, the name "Ἀσπαρ which appears in Procopius would still prove that the development of the group of phonemes *sp* was not homogeneous because the datum supplied by Stephanus could in no case derive from a time later than the fifth century A. D. It does not, in fact, matter very much whether we assign the parallel groups *sp* ~ *fs* to the third or the fifth century. But since it seems certain that Stephanus Byzantius took the datum **Ψενδαρτάκη* from a considerable earlier source, we may assume that, as early as the first century A. D., the Old Iranian group of phonemes *sp* was replaced in the language of some Iranian tribes of South Russia by *fs*.

Βωρόψαζος Olbia, Latyshev, *IOSPE* I, 64: in Miller's view it is the same name as *Βόρασπος* but it shows a later development of phonemes (*sp* > *fs*). Vasmer doubts this (*op. cit.*, 36) since, in his opinion, the phonemic change *sp* > *fs* had not yet taken place at the time. But having established the chronological position of the name *Ψενδαρτάκη* this argument loses its force. Hence the name *Βωρόψαζος* may safely be regarded as the transcription of the form **borāfsa-* 'having a roan horse'. The final element *-ζος* may probably be compared with the suffix *-tca-* or *-ca-* known from

⁸⁵ *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran*, II, 88.

⁸⁶ Honigmann: *RE* II, R. III, 2379.

⁸⁷ Harmatta, *Ant. Hung.* II, 32.

⁸⁸ Honigmann, *op. cit.*, 2384.

Saka (cp. *pātajsa* - 'kräftig', *rrātajsa* - 'löcherig', Konow, *Khotansakische Grammatik*, 68).

"Αψαχος Tanaïs, Книпович, Танаис No. 63 (220 and 236 A. D.). This name, too, may be regarded as the transcription of a form **afsax* < Old Iranian **aspa-axva*-. The first element "Αψ- corresponds exactly to Ossetian *āfsā* 'mare'. Thus it comes from a dialect in which the Old Iranian group of phonemes **sp* had developed into *fs*.

Ψώγας Olbia, Latyshev, *IOSPE* I, 81. This name probably hides a form **afsāγ*, so that it corresponds to Old Iranian **aspaka*-. It is worth noting that this name comes from the same district as Βωρόψαζος, viz. from Olbia.

Old Iranian **-sp-* > *-sf-*.

Σφαρόβαις Panticapacum. In Vasmer's view (*op. cit.*, 53) the word corresponds to the Old Persian name *vayaspāra*-, with the elements of the compound in the reverse order. The chief difficulty about this interpretation is that the etymology of the Old Persian name has not been satisfactorily explained. Bartholomae (*AirWb.*, 1358) divides it into *vayas-pāra*- and gives it the meaning 'der der Verfolgung ein Ende macht'. But this interpretation is by no means certain. The best course seems to be, therefore, to disregard the Old Persian word altogether and to try interpreting the name by itself. There are two possibilities for dividing the word: either as Σφαρο-βαις or as Σφα-ροβαις. In the first case, the element Σφαρο- may be compared with the Old Iranian word **spara*- 'Schild', while the second element βαις ο: *baya*- may be compared with either of the following words: Avestan *bay*- 'erschrecken' (Bartholomae, *AirWb.*, 927) or *bā*- 'scheinen' (Bartholomae, *AirWb.*, 952). The compound yields, in either instance, a satisfactory meaning: the sense is either 'one who inspires terror with his shield' or 'one shining with his shield'. On the other hand, if we divide the word into Σφα-ροβαις, the first element may be compared with Avestan *spā*- 'Gedeihen, Glück' (Bartholomae, *AirWb.*, 1616), while the element -ροβαις ο: **raḥaya*- may be compared with Avestan *rap*- 'Unterstützung gewähren — finden' (Bartholomae, *AirWb.*, 1508); the sense, in this case, would be 'one supported by good fortune'. Whichever possibility we accept the initial group of phonemes *sf-* corresponds in any case to Old Iranian **sp-*.

Ἀσφώρουγος Olbia, Latyshev, *IOSPE* I, 118. Miller and Justi (*Iranisches Namenbuch*, 47) connect this word with the name "Ἀσπουργος which, in its turn, is interpreted by Justi as corresponding to the Armenian name *Aspūrak*, while Miller and Tomaschek (*RE* II, 1738 foll.) thought to recognize the word *aspa*- in the first part of the compound. This latter suggestion is certainly correct but the second element of the name needs to be explained. The most obvious solution is to regard the name "Ἀσπουργος as a transcription of the compound **asp-urg* < **aspa-ugra*-, the second element of which, viz. *-ugra*-, may be compared with Avestan *ugra*- 'stark, kräftig'. For the development of the Old Iranian group of phonemes *-gr-* into *-rg-* there are numerous examples: in Ossetian, too, *-ry-* is the regular development of Old Iranian *-gr-*: Ossetian *čiry* < Old Iranian **tiγra*- etc. (see Miller, *Die Sprache der Osseten*, 36). Thus the name "Ἀσπουργος is a fairly clear compound which it is relatively easy to interpret: but this interpretation does not help one at all in explaining the sense of the name Ἀσφώρουγος because the element -ρουγος in this latter name obviously cannot be identified with the element -ουργος which admits of a clear interpretation. Yet, while we have to give up the identification of the name Ἀσφώρουγος with the name "Ἀσπουργος, the interpretation of the former is by no means a hopeless task. In the final element -ουγος we may recognize the suffix *-ug* which exists in Modern

Ossetian (-ug, -ig, -æg, see Miller, *op. cit.*, 90) and which used to exist also in the language of the Iazyges of Hungary (-uh, see Gombocz, *Ossetes et Iazyges*. Repr. 5). The remaining stem *Ἀσφωρ-* may be regarded without any difficulty as the equivalent of the Old Iranian word **aspabāra-* 'Reiter'. Hence it seems to be identical with the name *Aspar* discussed above, only the Old Iranian group of phonemes *-sp-* has here been replaced by *-sf-*, while the group of phonemes *-abā- > aβā- > -avā-* has been contracted to the labial phoneme *-ā-* (ω). Thus the name *Ἀσφώρουγος* ω: *asfār-ug*, too, shows the development of the Old Iranian group of phonemes **-sp-* into *-sf-*.

4.

The Old Iranian initial phoneme *p-* has two different developments: 1. *p-*, 2. *f-*.

Old Iranian **p-* > *p-*.

Πίδανος Tyras, Latyshev, *IOSPE* I, 2 (181 A. D.): ~ Avestan *pitar-* 'Vater' (Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 48); the name comes from the form **pita-na-*.

Πιτοφάρνάκης Tyras, Latyshev, *IOSPE* I, 2 (181 A. D.): ~ Avestan *pitar* + *φάρνάκης* (Vasmer, *loc. cit.*).

Πουρθαῖος Olbia, Latyshev, *IOSPE* I, 62: ~ Avestan *puθra-* 'Sohn' (Vasmer, *loc. cit.*).

Πουρθάκης Olbia, Latyshev, *IOSPE* IV, 15: < Old Iranian **puθra-ka-*.

Πίδεις Olbia, Latyshev, *IOSPE* I, 61: < **pita-*.

Πάτεις Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 302 (220 A. D.): < Old Iranian **pati-* 'Herr'.

Old Iranian **p-* > *f-*.

Φίδας Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 485 (103—203 A. D.): ~ Ossetian *fidä* 'Vater' < Old Iranian **pita-* (Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 55).

Φιδάνους Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 380 (236 A. D.): < Old Iranian **pita-na-*.

Φηδάνακος Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 379 (beginning of 3rd cent. A. D.): in Miller's view = Ossetian *fedavinag* 'friedliebend': this, however is phonetically impossible. The word has to be regarded simply as the result of further suffixation from **fida-* < Old Iranian **pita-*, formed with the group of suffixes *-na-ka-*, known to us from Sogdian and Saka (cp. Sogdian *-(')n'k: pwt'n'k* 'bouddhique', Benveniste, *Essai de grammaire sogdienne*, II, 95 and Saka *-naa-: āyīnaa-* 'Spiegel', Konow, *Khotansakische Grammatik*, 68).

Φορυάβακος Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 411 (175—211 A. D.): < Old Iranian **parugav-* 'rinderreich' (Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 55).

Φορήρακος Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 386 (225 and 212—229 A. D.) see above.

Φορίανος Tanais, Latyshev, *IOSPE* II, 447; < Old Iranian **paru-yava-* 'viel Getreide besitzend' (Vasmer, *loc. cit.*).

Φόδακος Phanagoria, Latyshev, *IOSPE* II, 364, Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 384 (211—219 A. D.): Miller tried to explain this word from Ossetian **fudag* 'ausgelassen, Schlingel'⁸⁹. But there is no evidence of this word being used as a proper

⁸⁹ Miller's interpretation is known to me only from Vasmer's work. The form *fudag* given by Vasmer is probably derived from the word *fud* 'das Böse' by means of the adjectival suffix *-ag*. In the dictionary of Miller-Freimann we find, however, the word *fudyag* 'ausgelassen etc.': hence it seems very likely that Miller actually had this word in mind. In this case his interpretation is unacceptable for phonetic reasons, too.

name. It is conceivable as a nickname, but this is contradicted by the widespread use of the name *Φόδακος*. It seems to have been the name of a large family or tribal unit, part of which lived in Phanagoria, part in Tanais. Thus it seems a likelier suggestion that the stem of the name *Φόδακος* which, after separating the suffix *-k* (*-κος*), appears as *Φόδα-α*: *fuda-* corresponds exactly to Avestan *puḍa-* 'Name einer iranischen Familie' (Bartholomae, *AirWb.*, 909). If this explanation is correct, we have here a second instance of an exact equivalent to one of the names in the Avesta among the Iranian tribes of South Russia. The importance of the first instance and the historical significance implied in the exact correspondence between the Avestan *fryāna-* 'Name einer gläubigen türischen Familie' and the name *Φλίανος* from Olbia have recently been emphasized by Nyberg (*Die Religionen des alten Iran*, 251).

Φόρος Tanais, Книпович, Танаис, No. 388 (228 A. D.): ~ Ossetian *fur* 'Hammel' (Miller, *Осетинские этюды* III, 80). The Ossetian word is, however, of unknown origin, so that it is probably more correct to assume, with Vasmer, that this name, too, is the short form of a compound containing the word **fur* which corresponds to Old Iranian **paru-* 'viel'. (see Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 55).

Φόσακος Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 389 (228 A. D.). Probably obtained by suffixation from the short form of a name belonging to the Old Iranian type **parupasu-*.

Φούρτας Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 390 (228 A. D.): ~ Ossetian *furt* 'Sohn' < Old Iranian **puθra-* (Vasmer, *loc. cit.*).

5.

The Old Iranian group of phonemes **fri-* has also a twofold development 1. *fli-*, 2. *li-*.

Old Iranian **fri-* > *fli-*.

Φλείμναχος Olbia, Latyshev, *IOSPE* I, 24: Vasmer (*loc. cit.*) regards this word as the equivalent of the Ossetian word *limän* 'Freund' and traces back both words to the Old Iranian form **friyamāna-*. The antecedents of this view were that Hübschmann (*Etymologie und Lautlehre der ossetischen Sprache*, 46) connected the Ossetian word *limän* with Avestan *frya-α*: *friya* and Old Indian *priya-*, both the latter meaning 'lieb, wert, freund', and suggested the idea of an exact correspondence between Ossetian *limän* and Old Indian *priyamāna-*. Miller, too, (*Осетинские этюды*, III, 83) sought to derive the Ossetian word from the Iranian stem **fri-*, without defining, however, more closely the Old Iranian form to which it might have corresponded. It was on the basis of the Old Indian form *priyamāṇa-* conjectured by Hübschmann that Vasmer restored his Old Iranian form **friyamāna-* which would correspond exactly to the name *Φλείμναχος* as well as to the Ossetian word *limän*. But this conjecture raises many difficulties. First of all, it is open to doubt that the group of phonemes *-īya-* developed into *-i-* ~ *-ə-* in Ossetian (*limän* — *lāmän*). On the basis of the correspondence between Western Ossetian *liyun* ~ Old Indian *riyate* (see Miller, *Die Sprache der Osseten*, 17) one would rather expect the development *-iy-* or *-iyu-* (the position is particularly clear in the 3rd person plural: *liyuncä* < Old Iranian **riyanti*). But even if one were to disregard this difficulty, it is certain that the form *-māna-* would have developed in Ossetian into *-mon*, not into *-mān* (cp. Ossetian *bon* 'Tag' < Old Iranian **bānu-*, Miller, *op. cit.*, 20). Thus the probable development in Ossetian of the Old Iranian form conjectured by Vasmer would be **liyumon* ~ **liumon*, perhaps **limon*. But the difficulties belong not only to the category of phonetics but also of semantics. The Old Indian form given by Hübsch-

mann is the participle of the verb *priyate* 'befriedigt, froh sein, Gefallen finden an': hence its meaning is 'glad, satisfied'. From this meaning it would be fairly difficult to deduce the meaning 'friend'. All these difficulties disappear, however, if we regard the name *Φλείμναχος* and the Ossetian word *limän* as developments of the Old Iranian compound **friya-manah-*. The first part of this compound would correspond to Avestan *frya-* 'lieb, wert, freund', while the second part to Avestan *manah-* 'Sinn, Geist: Denken, Gedanke'. The meaning of the compound would thus be 'freundlichen Sinn habend, freundlich gesinnt'. Similar compounds are very frequent in the *Ávesta*: *naire.manah-*, *hamō.manah-*, *hu.manah-*, etc. There exists also the compound expressing the exact antonym of **friya-manah-*: *duš-manah-* 'des Denken übel ist, des Denken feindlich ist, feindselig' (Bartholomae, *AirWb.*, 753—4). The Modern Persian *dušmān* which is the development of the Old Iranian compound *duš-manah-*, as well as the Greek word *δυσμενής* 'feindlich gesinnt, feindselig' which present a close parallel, later came to mean 'Feind'; in the same way the Old Iranian compound **friya-manah-* 'freundlich gesinnt' which developed into *limän* in Ossetian, came to acquire the meaning 'Freund'.

Φλιμάνναχος Olbia. See the foregoing.

Φλίανος Olbia, Latyshev, *IOSPE* I, 64: < Old Iranian **friyāna-* ~ Avestan *fryāna-* 'Name einer gläubigen türischen Familie' (Vasmer, *loc. cit.*). It is worth noting that all the three available forms which show the development *fri-* > *fli-* came from the same district, *viz.* Olbia.

Old Iranian *fri-* > *li-*.

Λείμναος Panticapaeum, Latyshev, *IOSPE* II, 29A, Tanais, Latyshev *IOSPE* II, 446; < Old Iranian **friya-manah-*.

Λίμναχος Gorgippia, Latyshev, *IOSPE* II, 402: *ῶ*: *limⁿna-k*. Same as the preceding, with the suffix **-ka-*.

6.

Old Iranian *r* before an *i* has also a twofold development: 1. *-l-*, 2. *-r-*.

Old Iranian *ri* > *l*.

Φαλδάρναος Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 364 (175—211 and 220 A. D.). The interpretations hitherto attempted are as follows: in Miller's view the word is a compound meaning 'aufhaltend, beseitigend'; the elements in the compound (*Φαλ-* and *-δάρνα-*) correspond to Ossetian *fäl* ~ Avestan *pairi* and to Avestan *darəna-* 'haltend, tragend' respectively. Justi tried to explain the word from Avestan *pāθra-* while Vasmer suggested a possible connection with the Ossetian word *fäldar* (the correct form is *faldär*) 'weiter' (see Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 54). None of these explanations is, however, acceptable. Vasmer's interpretation is unsatisfactory from the standpoint of semantics, while that of Justi (besides phonetic difficulties) leaves the ending *-ρανος* unexplained. Miller's solution is open to grave semantic objections, quite apart from the legitimate doubt whether the compound with the sense given by him may be used as a person's name. The meaning of the Avestan word *darəna-* is not 'haltend, tragend' (as Miller suggests) but 'Befestigung; Aufenthalt; Aufenthaltsort, Wohnsitz, Schlupfwinkel' (Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 692—3). True, the corresponding Old Indian word *dharāṇa-* does mean 'tragend, erhaltend'; but even if one were to assume a similar meaning in Old Iranian, the sense of the compound could at best be only 'erhaltend, aufrechterhaltend'.

Thus the solution must be sought on other lines. Phonetically, the name *Φαλδάρης* *ῥος*: *faldāran-* may be traced back not only to the form *pari-darana-* but also to **pari-tarana-*. The element *-dār* in the Ossetian word *faldār* quoted by Vasmer also goes back to an Old Iranian form **-tara-* (see Miller, *Осетинские этюды* III, 156 and Hübschmann, *op. cit.*, 35). This Old Iranian **pari-tara-(na)-* may be regarded as having been obtained by suffixation (by means of the comparative suffix *-tara-*) from the adverb and preposition **pari* ~ Avestan *pairi* meaning 'vorne; zuvor, früher' and 'um — herum, über-, über — hin'. Similar suffixed forms of adverbs and prepositions are very frequent in the language of the Avesta: *an-tara-* 'der innere, innen befindlich' (*an-* = Greek *ἐν*); *aiwi-tara-* 'außen (um das Land) herum gelegen, fremd' (*aiwi* 'zu, gegen — hin, gegen', etc.); *apāχ-tara-* 'rückwärts, hinten gelegen' (*apānk-* 'nach hinten, rückwärts gewendet'); *fra-tara-* 'der räumlich vordere, weiter vorn befindliche' (*fra* 'vorwärts, voran'); *niš-tara-* 'der äußere' (*niš* 'hinaus, weg'); *vi-tara-* 'der seitlichere; der weitere: (*vi* 'auseinander, abseits, getrennt von —'); see Bartholomae, *AirWh.* 132: 90, 87: 79, 82: 979, 974: 1087, 1439, 1435. Thus new words may be formed from nearly every adverb and preposition by means of the comparative suffix *-tara-*. The form **pari-tara-*, conjectured on the basis of the name *Φαλδάρης* fits well into this series, and probably means 'one in front, first'. Thus, semantically, the name *Φαλδάρης* is the exact equivalent of the Alanic name *Paria* < Old Iranian **parvya-* 'erster'. It only remains to remark that the Ossetian word *faldār* 'weiter' cannot be a development from this conjectured Old Iranian form **pari-tara-*, since the regular development in Ossetian would be **fäldār*; the first element in *faldār* — as Miller has pointed out correctly — corresponds to the Avestan word *para* 'fort, weg, zur Seite', so that the word must be traced back ultimately to the Old Iranian form **para-tara-*.

Old Iranian **ri-* > *r*.

Παρσπάναχος Olbia. In Miller's view, this name is a compound of the words corresponding to Avestan *pairi* and Old Indian *sphāna-* 'fett' (see in Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 48). But as Vasmer has already pointed out, the word corresponding to Old Indian *sphāna-* is missing from Iranian, so that some other interpretation must be sought for the second part of the name. This element *-σπαν* in the name *Παρσπάναχος* (*-αχος* is a wellknown suffix) may be compared with the Sogdian word *spn* *ῥ*: *span*. This word occurs in the compound *spnčyr-spn* (F. W. K. Müller, *Soghdische Texte* I, 40, 42, 43) which appears in the Greek text as *οἰκονόμος*. Hence the meaning of the word *spnčyr* must be 'household' while that of *spn* must be 'manager, administrator'. Thus the compound **par-span-ak* > **pari-spāna-ka-* must have meant approximately 'manager, inspector, administrator of a household'.

7.

We see also a twofold development in the case of the Old Iranian groups of phonemes **-ān-* and **-ām-*. In Modern Ossetian the corresponding groups of phonemes are usually *-on*, *-om* (see Miller, *Die Sprache der Osseten*, 20); this, however, is the result of a fairly recent development, because in the Ossetian place-names which survived in the Balkar, etc. territories formerly inhabited by Ossetes we usually find *a* instead of *o*; the same position is revealed also by the other Ossetian loan-words in Balkar and Karachay (see recently Abaev, *IAN SSSR OON* 1935, 890). The names in the inscriptions, too, still preserve largely the group of phonemes *-ān-*, *-ām-* where

there is the same group in Old Iranian; it is very important to note, however, that we already come across names here which show the correspondence *-on-*, *-om-*.

Old Iranian **-ān-*, **-ām-* > *-ān-*, *-ām-*.

Ἀλανοί see above: < Old Iranian **aryana-*; ~ Ossetian *iron*.

Ἀνδάναχος Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 14 (220 A. D.): ~ Ossetian *andon* 'Stahl' (Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 32).

Βάνας Panticapaeum, Latyshev, *IOSPE* II, 29: < Old Iranian **bānu-*: ~ Ossetian *bon* 'Tag'.

Ζάρανδος Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 223 (228 A. D.): ~ Ossetian *zāron* 'alt' (Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 39).

Νάμγηνος Olbia, Latyshev, *IOSPE* I, 55: ~ Ossetian *nomgin* 'namhaft' (Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 45).

Πίδανος see above: ~ Ossetian *fidon* 'väterlich'.

Σάναχος Olbia, Latyshev, *IOSPE* I, 75: ~ Saka *sāna-*, Sogdian *s'n*, Ossetian *son* 'Feind' (Harmatta, *Ant. Hung.* II, 35).

Sangibanus 'Prince of the Alans' Jordanes, *Getica*, 37: ~ Avestan *saṇha-* 'Spruch, Gebot, etc.' + *bānu-* 'Lichtstrahl, Strahl' = 'durch Gebote glänzend' (Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 50): ~ Ossetian *bon* 'Tag'.

Φιδάνους see above: ~ Ossetian *fidon*.

Φορήρανος see above: ~ Ossetian *iron*.

Old Iranian **-ān-*, **-ām-* > *-ōn-*, *-ōm-*.

Ἀρθάμων Olbia, Latyshev I, 52: according to Justi (*op. cit.*, 39) ~ Ossetian *art + mon* 'Feuergeist'. This interpretation is rendered unacceptable by the fact that Ossetian does not possess the word *mon* 'Geist'. The form quoted by Justi is only an etymological abstraction from the words *dālimon*, *dāluimon*, etc. given by Miller (*op. cit.*, 35); but these words must probably be divided as *dāl-uimon*, etc. (On this point see Schmidt, *FUF Anz.* XVIII 95—6, XIX, 19; Abaev, *IAN SSSR OON* 1935, 885), Vasmer compares the name with the Avestan word *arədamant-* 'Kläger'; this should have developed however, into the form *Ἀρθάμωνδος*. The difficulties disappear, however, if we regard the name *Ἀρθάμων* as the development of the Old Iranian compound **arta-mana-*, the elements of which correspond to the Avestan words *arəta-* 'Gesetz, Recht, heiliges Recht' and *mana-* 'Art und Weise' ('dessen Art und Weise das heilige Recht ist').

Μαιτώνιον 'a town beside the river Tyras' Ptolemy III 5, 15: ~ Avestan *maēθana-* 'Aufenthaltort, Wohnung, Haus' (Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 63).

Σιώμαχος Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 333 (beginning of 3rd cent. A. D.). Jacobsohn (*KZ* LIV, 273) has tried to explain this name from an Old Iranian form **syāvamaka-*: this interpretation seems, however, unconvincing since we cannot demonstrate the phonetic change *-āva-* > *-ō-* from the names in the inscriptions. On the other hand, the word seems to be an exact equivalent of the Avestan name *syāmaka-* 'Name eines Bergs oder Gebirgs' (Bartholomae, *AirWb.*, 1931). The corresponding form is known also from Old Indian: *śyāmaka-* 'dunkelfarbig' while the form *śyāma-* (without the suffix *-ka-*) is used also as a proper name. Thus the name *Σιώμαχος* may be regarded as the development of a supposed Old Iranian word *syāmaka-* 'dunkelfarbig' and may be read as *syōmaz*.

8.

The Old Iranian group of phonemes *-gr- developed also along two different lines: 1. -gr-, 2. -rg-.

Old Iranian *-gr- > -gr-.

''Αγροί 'tribe beside the Maeotis' Strabo, XI 2, 11, ''Αγροί Appianus, Mithr. 88: < Old Iranian *agra- ~ Avestan *ayra-* 'der erste, oberste'. Semantically, this tribal name corresponds exactly to the people's name Πάριοι (Strabo XI 9, 3) < Old Iranian *parvya- 'der erste'.

Old Iranian *-gr- > -rg-.

''Ασπουργος Gorgippia, Latyshev, IOSPE IV, 435: see above: < Old Iranian *aspa-ugra-.

Οὔργιος Panticapaeum, Latyshev, IOSPE IV, 366, Tanais, Latyshev, IOSPE II, 443: this name, hitherto unexplained, may be also regarded as an equivalent of Old Iranian *ugra- 'stark, kräftig'.

Οὔργβαζος Olbia, Latyshev, IOSPE I, 64: after the preceding two names this one can be solved almost automatically. Οὔργ- < Old Iranian *ugra-, -βαζος ~ Avestan *bāzu-* 'Arm': thus the whole name corresponds to an Old Iranian compound *ugra-bāzu- 'strong-armed', i. e. a *bahuvrihi*-type of compound.

9.

The Old Iranian group of phonemes *vi- also shows a twofold line of development: 1. vi-, 2. i-.

Old Iranian *vi- > vi-.

Βιδάκης Panticapaeum, Latyshev, IOSPE II, 29B: ~ Avestan *vid-* 'teilhaftig'; probably obtained by suffixation from the short form of a name belonging to the type of Avestan *vidat-gav-*.

Βίστης Panticapaeum, Latyshev, IOSPE IV, 255: in Vasmer's view, the name may be connected either with the Avestan word *višta-* 'Kämpfer' or is the short form of a name which belongs to the *Vištāspa*-type. Since, however, the *AirWb.* does not know of the word *višta-* and, moreover, since in the name *Vištāspa-* the element *višta-* has never been explained, it seems a likelier explanation that the name *Βίστης* developed from Old Iranian *vista-* or the short form of some compound in which this word is a constituent element (cf. e. g. Avestan *vistō.fraorəta-* 'der das Glaubensbekenntnis kennt').

Old Iranian *vi- > i-.

''Ινσάξαγος Olbia, Latyshev, IOSPE I, 65: ~ Avestan *visaiti*, see above.

10.

A twofold development may be also observed in the case of the Old Iranian group of phonemes *ha-: 1. ha-, 2. a-.

Old Iranian *ha- > ha-.

Χανάκης Panticapaeum: ~ Avestan *hana-* 'alt' (Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 56).

Old Iranian *ha- > a-.

Ἀζαρίων Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 4 (220 A. D.): ~ Avestan *hazaŋra-* 'tausend' (Vasmer, *op. cit.* 30).

Ἀβδάρδα 'Alanic name of Theodosia' Anonym. Peripl. Ponti Eux. 77: Ἀβδ- ~ Avesta *hapra* 'sieben' (Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 72).

Ἀφθαίμαχος, Ἀφθείμαχος Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 63 (236 and 220 A. D.): ~ Ossetian *ävďäimag* 'der siebente' (Vasmer, *op. cit.* 32).

11.

The Old Iranian group of phonemes *χš-, too, has two different developments: 1. χš- or χs-, 2. š- or s-.

Old Iranian *χš- > χš-.

Ἀλέξαρχος see above: -ξαρχος ~ Avestan *χšaŋra-* 'Herrschaft, Reich'.

Διδυμόξαρχος Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 106 (189 A. D.): -ξαρχος see above.

Δοσυμόξαρχος Tanais, Книпович, Танаис No. 261 (220 and 228 A. D.): -ξαρχος see above.

Καινάξαρχος Olbia, Latyshev, *IOSPE* I; 54: -ξαρχος see above.

Κηνέξαρχος Olbia, Latyshev, *IOSPE* IV, 17: see the preceding.

Ξάρθανος Tanais, Latyshev, Книпович, Танаис No. 264 (beginning of 3rd cent. A. D.): ~ Old Iranian *χšaŋra-na- (Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 45).

Ξάρταμος Olbia, *IAK* 18, 103 No. 4: ~ Old Iranian *χšaŋra- 'Herrschaft' + *ama-* 'stark, kräftig' combine to form a compound the meaning of which is 'durch seine Herrschaft kräftig'.

Ξόβας Panticapaeum, *IAK* 10, 41 No. 35. This name, hitherto unexplained, may be regarded as the equivalent of an Old Iranian word *χšauba- 'excitable', a present participle formed with the suffix -a- from the verb χšaub- (~ Avestan *χšaob-* 'in Aufregung geraten', Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 542).

Old Iranian χš- > š-.

Σαίταφάρνης 'King of the Saii' Olbia, Dittenberger, Syll. No. 495. This name was interpreted by Tomaschek (see Justi, *op. cit.*, 279) as a compound consisting of equivalents of the Avestan words *šaēta-* 'Geld, Vermögen' and *χ^vvarənah-* (Old Persian *farnah-*) 'Ruhm, Ruhmesglanz, Herrlichkeit, Hoheit, Majestät' (see Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 1704, 1870). This explanation is unimpeachable both from the semantic and the phonetic points of view. Hence the name Σαίταφάρνης must be read as *šaita-farn* and its meaning is 'der durch Vermögen Herrlichkeit besitzt'. The initial phoneme š- in the Avestan word *šaēta-* goes back to the group of phonemes χš- (< *χšaīta-); see Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 1704; Kuiper, *ZII* VIII, 245.

Σαῖοι 'Sarmatian tribe in the district of Olbia', Olbia, Dittenberger, *loc. cit.* This people's name was compared by Tomaschek, *Thraker* I, 99 with the Avestan word *χšaya-* 'Herrscher, Fürst, König' (Bartholomae, *AirWb.*, 550). This interpretation was, however, called in question by Vasmer (*op. cit.*, 50), on the ground that we find the phoneme š- instead of χš- in initial position. Under the influence of Vasmer's arguments I myself rejected Tomaschek's explanation and connected the name Σαῖοι with the Avestan word *sāy-* 'ungleichmäßig gefärbt, scheckig' (e. g. in the proper name *sāyuzdri-*, the real meaning of which is 'des weibliche Zugtiere scheckig sind'; see Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 1569, 1572). In this case this people's name would belong to the same type of names as Turkish *bulaq*, *ala yontlu*, etc. meaning 'piebald, hav-

ing pied horses' (see *Folia Ethnographica* I, 130). Although this interpretation cannot be objected to either on phonetic or on semantic grounds, and is still a possible alternative, we have to point out that Tomaschek's explanation is by no means improbable — in fact, in some respects it seems more likely. Vasmer's objection with regard to the initial phonemes falls to the ground, since in the name of Saitapharnes, King of the Saii, we find precisely the same correspondence of *š-* to the Old Iranian initial group of phonemes *χš-* (the correctness of the interpretation of the king's name can hardly be doubted). Thus we are justified in comparing the people's name *Σαῖοι* with the Avestan word *χšaya-* 'Herrscher' as well as its Modern Iranian equivalents, viz. Wakhi *šai* 'fat, rich' and Šughni *šayēn* 'khans' (see Morgenstierne, *Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages*, II, 541), the phonemic forms of which show a perfect correspondence. Compared with the former explanation, this interpretation of the people's name *Σαῖοι* is rendered more likely by the circumstance that the Saii — judging from the data in the Protogenes-inscription — were probably the leading tribe or ruling class in a tribal federation. In this respect they may be compared with the leading or ruling tribes of other nomadic Iranian tribal federations or nomadic empires, e. g. with the 'Royal' Scythians or the 'Royal' Sarmatians, etc. whose names expressed precisely their outstanding social position. Among the names of such 'royal' tribes we find e. g. the people's names *Ξάνδοι* = *χšayant-* 'herrschend' and *Πάριοι* = *parva-* 'erster' (on these various points see Harmatta, *ESIR* II, 29); the name *Σαῖοι* = *χšaya-* 'Herrscher' fits well into this series. Thus, from the sociological angle, this latter interpretation of the name of the Saii seems preferable to the former.

4. Conclusions

If we sum up the results of our observations we get the following picture

Old Iranian	Iranian of South Russia				Ossetian	
	1	2	3	4	Western	Eastern
*ar-y-	ar-(y)-	al-	ir-	il-	īr-	īr-
*au	au	ō			ō	u
*sp	sp	sf	fs		fs	fs
*p-	p-	f-			f-	f-
*fri-	fli-	li-			li-	lə-
*ri	r	l			l	l
*ān	-ān	-ōn			-on	-on
ām	-ām	-ōm			-om	-om
*gr	gr	rg			rγ, lγ	rγ, lγ
*vi-	vi-	i-			ι-	∅
*ha-	ha-(χα-)a-				χα-, a-	χα-, a-
*χš-	χš-	š-			χs-	χs

Thus the examination of the Pontic Greek inscriptions and the Iranian names preserved in classical sources on South Russia clearly shows that, as early as the first centuries A. D., the language of the Iranian tribes inhabiting the steppes of Eastern Europe was by no means homogeneous. The phonemic differences appearing in the names amply prove that these tribes spoke several dialects, obviously corresponding to the nature of their tribal division. This fact is important for several reasons. First of all, the picture which we derive, after examining these names, about the linguistic condition of the Iranian tribes in South Russia is in entire harmony with the observations made by us above concerning the language of the Median and Persian tribes. Secondly, this result enables us to approach the examination of the relationship between the Finno-Ugrian and the Iranian languages from a new angle: the realization that there existed several Iranian languages or dialects in South Russia will make it possible to interpret several phonemic features, hitherto unexplained, in the Iranian loan-words of the Finno-Ugrian languages.

Naturally, it would be extremely important, both for clearing up the dialectology of the Iranian languages and the historical background of Finno-Ugrian and Iranian linguistic connections if we could give a precise ethnical delimitation to the various Iranian dialects. But this is a very difficult task. At present most of the names cannot be assigned to any definite tribes nor do we know how the various phonemic differences crystallize into structural features which separate the dialects from one another. But the problem is not insoluble. First of all, we can gather some indications from the names themselves. Thus *e. g.* those dialects which give us the names *Πουρθαῖος* and *Φούρτας*, in spite of the difference in the development of Old Iranian initial **p-* are nevertheless united by certain common features since they show a similar development of the Old Iranian group of phonemes *-θr-*. The same development of the Old Iranian group of phonemes *-θr-* is seen, however, also in the name *Ἀλέξαρθος* < **Ἀλάξαρθος*, so that we may assume its close connection with the former dialects. Moreover, since in the people's name *Ἀλανοί* we see the same development of the Old Iranian initial group of phonemes **ary-* as in the name *Ἀλέξαρθος*, this word, too, must be included in this group. Thus we are beginning to see the outlines of a group of dialects which, on the strength of certain phonemic criteria, is connected with Ossetian though it is clearly distinguishable from the latter by other phonemic phenomena. At the same time, there are some Sarmatian dialects which are fairly distant from either group (*cp. e. g.* Iazygian *Βανάδασπος* and Thatean *Ἀριφάρνης*). Besides these phonemic connections arising from the names themselves, a careful comparison of the geographical distribution of the names with the historical sources, as well as the examination of the historical and ethnical conditions in the various Greek settlements, a task recently attempted by Knipovich in his book on Tanais (Танаис, Историко-археологическое исследование. Москва-Ленинград 1949) — all this will make possible the ethnical and historical evaluation of the linguistic differences established in this essay. This much we may safely say, in any case, that on the ground of phonemic criteria alone one may distinguish at least four languages or dialects: through the various concatenations of phonemic peculiarities this number will be doubled.

The fact that the Iranian tribes of South Russia spoke several languages or dialects, clearly distinguishable from one another, as early as the first centuries A. D., has important consequences in clearing up the linguistic relations between Sarmatians, Alans, and Ossetes. Although this question may be solved only by a close examination of Alanic linguistic remains and the history of Ossetian phonemes, we may confidently state that the simple, generalizing historical identification of the language of

the Scythians, Sarmatians, Alans, and present-day Ossetes is not a probable proposition. Since the names hailing from the territory of the Alans as well as of the other Sarmatian tribes point to the existence of several dialects, it is obvious that the language of the Sarmatians or that of the Alans as a whole cannot be simply regarded as being Old Ossetian. Moreover, some of the Sarmatian dialects show certain phonemic peculiarities (e. g. $-\bar{a}n > -\bar{o}n$) which are quite recent developments in Ossetian. The same situation prevails also in Alanic. Thus e. g. the name *Σανάων* (Tanaïs 225 A. D., Книпович, Танаис No. 327) shows already the change from Old Iranian, *syāva-* to the form *sau* which is characteristic of Ossetian. At the same time, however, we see in this word also the change $-\bar{a}n > -\bar{o}n$ which is a much later development in Ossetian. Thus this Alanic name from Tanaïs (о: *sāuanōn* < Old Iranian **syāva-nāna-*), together with other names pointing in the same direction, is a clear proof that Ossetian only represents the outcome of a single Alanic dialect group, the historical development of which was different from that of the Sarmatian dialects attested by the Iranian names occurring in the inscriptions of the North Pontic Greek cities.

APPENDIX I

Additional Notes

To p. 7. During the last two decades an admirable research work was done by Soviet archaeologists who elucidated many problems concerning the history and material culture of the Iranian peoples of Eastern Europe. Much has been done as regards the Cimmerian and Scythian Epoch in Hungary too.

To p. 8. In spite of the old opinion, wide-spread among archaeologists even to-day (adopted also by me in the 1st edition) we cannot presume the immigration of the Scythians into Hungary. A summary of my recent views about the history and material culture of the Cimmerii and Scythians was published in *Ant. Tan.* 13 (1966) 107 foll.

To p. 9. The problem of the identity of the Sauromatae and Sarmatians was much discussed by Soviet scholars during the last decades. Regarding my argumentation expounded in the 1st edition as essentially correct even to-day, I only refer to the view-point of K. F. Smirnov which seems to be only right. He writes: "Я далек от мысли полностью отождествить савроматов с более поздними сарматскими племенами, но считаю, что именно из племенных объединений савроматов вышли и на их основе сформировались крупные политические союзы сарматов..." (Савроматы. 3). Cf my exposition on p. 9—10.

To p. 10. Following V. Latyschew D. M. Pippidi has dated the Protogenes inscription to the first half of the 3rd century B. C. recently (*Epigraphische Beiträge zur Geschichte Histrias in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit.* 15). That this dating is impossible and that we can only think of the end of the 3rd or the beginnings of the 2nd century B. C., was convincingly demonstrated by the careful study of T. N. Knipovich (*VDI* 1966/2. 142—149). The Galatae of the Protogenes inscription may represent the Bastarnae who can be regarded as a Celtic tribe according to the recent investigation by Z. Mády (Припонтийские кельты. Античное общество. Moscow 1967. 179 foll.).

To p. 11. I now prefer the interpretation of the name *Saii* from Old Iranian *xšaya- and that of *Saitapharnes* from Old Iranian *xšaita-farnah-. Cf. also p. 94—95, 107.

To p. 16. On Atheas and the Western Scythians cf. T. V. Blavatskaya: *VDI* 1948/1. 206 foll., B. N., Grakov: Каменское городище на Днепре. Moscow 1954. 9 foll., D. M. Pippidi: *Epigraphische Beiträge* 61—64, D. B. Shelov: *NS* 2 (1965) 16 foll., D. P. Kallistov: *VDI* 1969/1. 124 foll. With his well-known aversion against Scythians Pippidi denies the occupation by Atheas of the Dobrudja, while Kallistov restricts the rule of this Scythian king exactly to this territory. By the way it should be mentioned that neither I myself said (cf. *Das Volk der Sadagaren.* 25 foll.) nor M. Rostovtzeff (whose argumentation in *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, 86 foll.,

05 foll. was summarized by me *loc. cit.*) asserted anywhere that Poroina lies in the Dobrudja as Pippidi ascribed to me (*Epigraphische Beiträge* 62, note 10). Rostovtzeff proposed in my opinion correctly that the territory of the Scythian state in the Dobrudja also included the land north of the Danube. Therefore, he also reckoned (p. 86) the rhyton from Poroina to the archaeological remains of the Scythian state the centre of which was lying in the Dobrudja. Otherwise, it is to be regretted that my remarks putting the rhyton from Poroina in another historical context (cf. *Studies on the History of the Sarmatians*. 23 and here p. 29 above) escaped the attention of Pippidi.

To p. 19. On the economic crisis of Olbia cf. N. V. Shafranskaya: VDI 1951/3. 105 foll. On the economic ties of the North Pontic Greek cities with the Scythians cf. N. A. Onaiko: VDI 1970/1. 112 foll. On Late Scythian culture along the Lower Dnieper cf. M. I. Vyaz'mitina: SA 1969/4. 62 foll.

To p. 20. The Epikrates inscription was again discussed by D. M. Pippidi: *Epigraphische Beiträge* 51 foll. He tried to prove that it originates from Histria. Unfortunately, the Apollonios inscription from Olbia offering an exact parallel to the Epikrates inscription (published by Y. I. Levi: VDI 1953/1. 177 foll. and again in *Надписи Ольвии* 1917—1965. No. 28) escaped his attention. Surely we have to reckon the Epikrates inscription to the epigraphic materials of Olbia in the future too. Otherwise Pippidi correctly recognized that the Epikrates inscription is to be dated to the 3rd century B. C. It may reflect the same critical epoch (middle of the 3rd century B. C.) as the Apollonios inscription mentioned above.

To p. 20. D. M. Pippidi; *Epigraphische Beiträge* 89 foll. tried to prove with a detailed argumentation that the Aristagoras inscription originates from the second half of the 1st century B. C. He is, of course, right in stating that the inscription is written in the new alphabet appearing on the epigraphic monuments of Histria during the 1st century B. C. The point is, however, that for the scarcity of epigraphic materials originating from the end of the 2nd and the beginnings of the 1st centuries B. C. we cannot exactly determine the date of the introduction of the new alphabet. Surely it was introduced before 80 B. C., but one can think of an even earlier date. Accordingly, the Aristagoras inscription can be dated to the first half or even to the beginnings of the 1st century B. C. (*i. e.* to that very epoch I supposed) with the same right as to the second half of the 1st century B. C.

To p. 21. On Dacian influence in the territory between Dnieper and Dniester cf. M. I. Vyaz'mitina: *Городища Нижнего Днепра рубежа н. э. и их связи с карпато-даридайнскими странами. Studien zur Geschichte und Philosophie des Altertums*. Budapest 1968. 247 foll.

To p. 24—29. L. Havas, *Ant. Tan.* 12 (1965) 242 foll. similarly made an attempt to prove the real possibility of the military expedition on land from the Balkans planned by Mithridates VI against the Romans. Curiously, my argumentation published years earlier in the 1st edition, escaped his attention.

To p. 31. foll. On the Yüeh-chih migration cf. F. Altheim: *Weltgeschichte Asiens in griechischen Zeitalter*. I. Halle/Saale 1947. 51 foll., II. 1948. 88 foll., F. Altheim: *Ubergang der Alten Welt*. I. Frankfurt/Main. 37 foll., F. Altheim: *Geschichte der Völker und Völker*. I. Berlin 1959. 61 foll., A. K. Narain: *The Indo-Greeks*. Oxford 1957. 128 foll., V. M. Masson — V. A. Romodin: *История Афганистана* I. Moscow 1964. 188 foll., B. G. Gafurov — A. M. Belenitskiy: *История таджикского народа* I. Moscow 1964. 341 foll.

To p. 37. N. Fettich, *Acta Arch. Hung.* 3 (1953) 170 foll. looks for the workshop of the discussed group of phaleræ in Olbia and dates it to the time about the middle

of the 1st century B. C. Taking into consideration, however, the situation of Olbia about the middle of the 1st century B. C., we have surely to regard this assumption as unacceptable. We can rather think of Panticapaeum. Nor can the dating to the middle of the 1st century B. C. of this group of phalerae be adopted.

To p. 41. In my paper "*Iranier, Germanen und Römer im Mittleren Donaubecken*" I pointed out in 1960 that the immigration of the Jazyges possibly took place at an earlier date as it was assumed so far. I quote the relevant passage: "Es wird meistens angenommen, daß die Jazygen zwischen 18 und 20 n. Zw. in die große ungarische Tiefebene eingewandert sind. Diese Auffassung stützt sich einerseits darauf, daß Aquincum in dieser Zeit eine militärische Besatzung und ein Lager erhielt, andererseits, daß die Jazygen noch zwischen 9 und 17 n. Zw. von Ovid in der Nähe von Tomi erwähnt werden. Es scheint trotzdem nicht unmöglich zu sein, daß die ersten Jazygenscharen im Theißgebiet schon früher erschienen sind. Wir können auf eine Angabe des Eusebios hinweisen, wonach Tiberius im Jahre 7 n. Zw. mit den Dalmatern zusammen auch die Sarmaten zur Anerkennung der römischen Oberhoheit gezwungen hat. Da die militärischen Operationen des Tiberius während des großen pannonischen Aufstandes im wesentlichen auf das Gebiet zwischen Save und Draava beschränkt waren, so ist es sehr wahrscheinlich, daß diese Sarmaten, die damals mit den Dalmatern zusammen von ihm besiegt wurden, schon in der Nähe der pannonischen Stämme, irgendwo in der Theißebene sesshaft waren. So könnte man daran denken, daß die Einwanderung der Jazygen in die ungarische Tiefebene viel früher erfolgt sein könnte, als man bisher angenommen hatte. Durch diese Annahme ließe sich auch diejenige Textstelle bei Lukan leichter verstehen, wonach die Jazygen zu seiner Zeit schon seit einem Jahrhundert in der Nähe von Pannonien gelebt hätten. Man darf sich diese Bewegung der Jazygen kaum als einen einzigen Vorstoß nach dem Nordwesten vorstellen. Wie wir noch sehen werden, lebten diese Iranier auch noch 100 Jahre später in einer ziemlich losen Sippen- und Stammesorganisation. So liegt es nahe daran zu denken, daß ihr Vordringen in kleineren Scharen, Sippen oder Stämmen vor sich gegangen ist. Durch diese Annahme läßt sich auch ihre Erwähnung bei Ovid erklären. Als die ersten Gruppen der Jazygen schon zwischen der Donau und der Theiß sesshaft waren, mögen andere Stämme von ihnen noch in Muntenien und in der Nähe von Tomi gelebt haben."

To p. 43. Cf. additional note to p. 19. (Shafranskaya).

To p. 45. Two problems were mostly discussed during the last two decades: 1. The immigration into Hungary of the various Sarmatian tribes, 2. The ethnical background and chronology of the different Sarmatian find groups. A. Mócsy, *Acta Arch. Hung.* 4 (1954) 120 foll. and M. Párducz, *Acta Arch. Hung.* 7 (1956) 174 foll. supposed the immigration of new Sarmatian groups (? Roxolani) at the beginning of the 2nd Sarmatian Period (about 180), while Á. Salamon, *FA* 11 (1959) 75 foll. thought of the appearance of new Sarmatian immigrants on the territory of the Kiszombor—Ernőháza find group during the second half of the 3rd century B. C. All these suggestions deserve consideration, even though the archaeological material does not yet permit a definitive solution of the problem.

To p. 46. A. Mócsy, *Acta Arch. Hung.* 4 (1954) 120, note 51 proposed to regard the pelta-shaped buckles as Roman imports instead of Pontic ones as I supposed. The possibility, of course, cannot be excluded that some of these buckles were imported from Pannonia. We must take, however, into consideration that such buckles were also produced in the North Pontic Greek cities and the specimens found in Eastern Europe cannot be regarded as Roman imports. Moreover, the chalcedony buckle found at Monor is surely of eastern origin. Accordingly, admitting the pos-

ability of Roman import on the one hand, we must certainly regard at least a part of the pelta-shaped buckles as imported from the Pontic region on the other hand.

To p. 48. On the Alans cf. F. Altheim: *Geschichte der Hunnen. I.* Berlin 1959. 55 foll., 57—75.

To p. 50. The problem of the cemeteries with barrow graves was often discussed in recent times. At first dating the northern group of the cemeteries with barrow graves to the end of the 2nd and the first half of the 3rd centuries A. D. L. Barkóczi ascribed this group of finds to the Vandals (*Intercisa. II.* AH XXXVI. Budapest 1957. 509 foll.). Later, in *Ant. Tan* 6 (1959) 247 and *Acta Ant. Hung.* 7 (1959) 447 he abandoned this theory. D. Gabler also dated the northern group of the cemeteries with barrow graves at least partly to the same epoch (AÉ 95 [1968] 232). On the archaeological materials of the 2nd and 3rd Sarmatian Periods cf. M. Párducz: *Denkmäler der Sarmatenzeit Ungarns. III.* and J. Harmatta: *Acta Arch. Hung.* 2 (1952) 341 foll. L. Barkóczi suggested to see the Roxolani in the population of the group of Kiszombor—Ernőháza (*Ant. Tan.* 6 [1959] 248 foll. and *Acta Ant. Hung.* 7 [1959] 448 foll.).

On the basis of these discussions the immigration and tribal stratification of the Sarmatians in Hungary seem to be a more complicated historical phenomenon than it could be recognized before two decades. The immigration of the Roxolani possibly began already during the 2nd century A. D. and besides them we can perhaps reckon also with the settlement in Hungary of the other tribes of the Sarmatian tribal confederacy controlling the Northwestern Pontic region at the Age of Mithridates VI.

To p. 55. On Regalianus and the Roxolani cf. now J. Fitz: *Ingenius et Régalien.* Collection Latomus. Vol. LXXXI. Bruxelles—Berchem 1966. 49 foll.

To p. 56. I now reckon the Sarmatian sword found at Szil (County Somogy) to the archaeological remains of the Sarmatian auxiliary troops recruited by Emperor Marcus Aurelius. Cf. also the remarks by M. Párducz: *Acta Arch. Hung.* 7 (1956) 158, 174.

To p. 56. In my paper "*Iranier, Germanen und Römer im Mittleren Donabecken*" I elucidated the problem of the *Ardaragantes* (this is the correct form of the name!) and *Limigantes* (including the interpretation of the names) in a detailed manner.

To p. 56. F. Altheim proposed to interpret the name *Sadagarii* as Turk **sadaqar* 'quiver-men' in F. Altheim — H.-W. Haussig: *Die Hunnen in Osteuropa. Ein Forschungsbericht.* Baden-Baden 1958. 24, note 68. This interpretation neglects the fact that the *Sadagarii* (or *Sadagares*) are never denoted as Huns (the passage of Pseudo-Julian definitely speaks against such a presumption). Later Altheim abandoned this explanation and *Geschichte der Hunnen.* V. Berlin 1962. 27 he compared the name *Sadagarii* with Avestan *satō.kara-*, in which, however, the interpretation of the second element is entirely uncertain. L. Zgusta (*Die Personennamen griechischer Städte der nördlichen Schwarzmeerküste.* Praha 1955. 263) rejected the etymology **sata-gari-* proposed by M. Vasmer for two reasons: 1. the interpretation neglects the form *Sadagi-*, 2. *-arii* is the well-known Late Latin suffix. Unfortunately he did not know my paper *Das Volk der Sadagaren* (*Analecta Orientalia Memoriae Alexandri Csoma De Kőrös Dicata.* Budapestini 1942—1947. 17 foll.), in which I drew attention to the first evidence for the name in a letter by Pseudo-Julian giving the form *Sadagares* in Greek. Besides, I also referred to the fact that the identification of the *Sadagarii* with the *Sadagi*s encounters serious difficulties.

To p. 56. From the view-point of the history of the Late Sarmatians the importance of two results of the archaeological research is still to be stressed here: 1. During the last decades Soviet and Roumanian archaeologists succeeded to discover

the archaeological remains of the Late Sarmatians settled on the territory between the Dniester and the Danube. Their results (cf. E. A. Rikman: SE 1966/1. 68 foll.) permit now to establish the ties between the Sarmatian tribes of the Great Hungarian Plain and those living east of the Carpathians with more certainty than before. 2. The other important result is that recognition that the population of the Chernyakhovo culture can be identified with the Goths (M. I. Artamonov: Проблемы всеобщей истории 1967. 48 foll.). At long last on the basis of this recognition the relation between the Late Sarmatians and the Goths can now be studied by the help of the archaeological finds.

To p. 58. In connection with my views regarding the language of the Sarmatians an argument arose in two essential points: 1. the family-tree theory, 2. the problem of the Sarmatian dialects and their relation with Scythian on the one hand and Alanic and Ossetian on the other hand.

As to the first point I should like to emphasize that rejecting the family-tree theory I did not call in question the genealogical relationship of languages. But I insist on the statement that the family-tree theory presents no suitable model for the real development of languages. This was, perhaps, overemphasized by me at that time but in view of the remarks made by V. I. Abaev and I. Gershevitch on this subject, I think even now that it was necessary.

My esteemed friend Professor V. I. Abaev regards all Northern Iranian linguistic materials (including Scythian, Sarmatian, Alan and even Saka names) as Scythian (Осетинский и язык и фольклор. I. Moscow—Leningrad 1949. 148). Moreover he thinks that it is "to force an open door" if one tries to prove the existence of Sarmatian dialects on the one hand, but at the same time assuming that all data only reflect different stages of the same phonemic development leading uniformly to Ossetian, he actually denies the existence of different Sarmatian dialects on the other hand. The same opinion was expressed by W. P. Schmidt, BzN 7 (1956) 209 foll. while L. Zgusta wanted to reduce the number of the dialects reflected by the Iranian names occurring in the Pontic Greek inscriptions to two and to regard these as two different languages, viz. Scythian and Sarmatian, instead of various dialects of the Sarmatian (*Die Personennamen griechischer Städte der nördlichen Schwarzmeerküste* 245 foll., Acta Orient. Hung. 4 [1954] 245 foll.). It seems that sometimes it is not easy to force even an open door.

Hoping that I shall still have the possibility to publish a detailed analysis of all Scythian, Sarmatian and Alanic linguistic materials, I would only insist on the following points.

1. From historical view-point it is impossible to regard all Iranian tribes and languages of Eastern Europe and even Central Asia as Scythian. This would mean a return to the linguistic usage of the ancient and mediaeval historians and geographers who denoted practically all Eastern peoples, even the Hungarians as Scythians. As I pointed out almost three decades ago (*Quellenstudien zu den Skythika des Herodot.* Budapest 1942.), among the ancient authors it is only Herodotos who clearly differentiated the Scythians from the other Northern and Eastern peoples on the basis of the language and customs. It is, therefore, only correct to regard the tribes denoted by Herodotos as Scythian ones and their historical descendants as Scythians.

2. As to the "open door" I would only remark that my humble paper was the first attempt to prove the existence of different dialects (or languages) within "Sarmatian". It makes a difference to guess something or to prove it.

3. The argumentation that the linguistic differences reflected by the Iranian names occurring in the Pontic Greek inscriptions only represent different stages of

the same linguistic development leading uniformly to Ossetian, is a simple sophistry. With similar argumentation one could assume that Parthian developed into Persian because in comparison to the latter it preserved an earlier stage of linguistic development in most cases. The only fact we can establish is the existence of linguistic differences reflecting various dialects (or languages), while the assertion that all Sarmatian languages (or dialects) developed uniformly into Ossetian, is a mere invention without any real basis.

4. The theory expounded by Zgusta cannot be accepted for the following reasons:

a) Neither did he study the geographical distribution of the linguistic data thoroughly enough nor did he qualify the names according to the various Scythian and Sarmatian peoples. One must not operate with such vague concepts as "Scythian" or "Sarmatian" at that late epoch.

b) In the 2nd and 3rd centuries A. D., *i. e.* at the time to which the bulk of the names is to be dated, we can no more speak of Scythians.

c) Zgusta did not take into consideration either the interrelation of the phonemic changes jointly occurring in the same names (cf. my *Studies in the Languages of the Iranian Tribes in South Russia*, 55 and here p. 96 above), or the fact that evidences for different dialects frequently occur in the one and same Greek city.

d) He tried to eliminate all linguistic data, *e. g.* even the name *Alani*, which contradict his theory of the existence of only one Scythian and one Sarmatian languages in the North Pontic region in the 2nd—4th centuries A. D. This is, of course, inadmissible. For further details I refer to my forthcoming study mentioned above.

5. Gershevitch thinks that the dialect differentiation of the Sarmatian "cannot be assigned to particular areas or tribes" and some of the differences "may not be synchronic, but due to diachronic sound-change within one dialect". Contrary to his assertion Zgusta has proved in any case that at least a great part of the dialect differences can be assigned to particular areas. As to the "diachronic sound-change" I refer to my remarks above.

6. Gershevitch does not understand against what I was arguing when discussing the character of the Sarmatian language, because in his opinion nobody to-day takes the term "family-tree" literally and to speak of the Sarmatian or Alanic *language* instead of group of languages, "is merely a convenient simplification". I do not want to discuss here whether any simplification — convenient or inconvenient — of the reality can be regarded as correct or to insist on the question what means to take the family-tree theory (not term!) literally or not literally. I only refer to the fact that Gershevitch admits the dialectal differentiation of Proto-Iranian theoretically, at the same time, however, he adheres to the purely formal linguistic concept of Proto-Iranian as one can state on the basis of his remarks regarding Proto-Iranian **puθra-*. Thus he does not realize that these two conceptions are irreconcilable with each other. Proto-Iranian as a formal linguistic concept means the total of the common linguistic features which can be deduced by the comparison either of the Old (sometimes Middle or even Modern) Iranian languages or of Old Iranian and Old Indian. In this sense Proto-Iranian must, of course, represent a linguistic unit because precisely the unity of the common features is the logical postulate of its existence. This Proto-Iranian is, however, only a linguistic abstraction which can never correspond to reality. Therefore, I proposed to reinterpret Proto-Iranian and other similar purely linguistic concepts from the historical point of view and to replace these abstractions without space and time by the reconstructions of historically definable languages or linguistic states. This was discussed by me *Studies in the Language of the Iranian*

Tribes in South Russia 22 foll. at length. Apparently Gershevitch did not understand my argumentation and he confused the linguistic and historical concepts of Proto-Iranian. That was exactly against what I was arguing. It is interesting to observe that after all Gershevitch, BSOAS 17 (1955) 486 joined to the theory according to which the Alans "were brought from the area of Lake Aral to the Caucasus by a migratory movement". This conception implies, of course, that the Alans have nothing to do with the Scythians and the Sarmatians.

To p. 62. On the Ossetian dialects cf. V. I. Abaev: *Осетинский язык и фольклор*. I. 357 foll., G. Akhvlediani: *Сборник избранных работ по осетинскому языку*. I. 60 foll., M. I. Isaev: *Дигорский диалект осетинского языка*. Moscow 1966. 5—112 and *Изв. ЮОНИИ АН СССР* 14 (1965) 140 foll.

To p. 62. The most important works of V. I. Abaev are now joined in his valuable book *Осетинский язык и фольклор*. I.

To p. 62. My review of the results and theories of my esteemed friend Professor V. I. Abaev is very incomplet. The whole richness of his life-work is now to be found in his *Осетинский язык и фольклор*. I. and *Историко-этимологический словарь осетинского языка*. I. Moscow—Leningrad 1958.

To p. 63. Against the confrontation of Alanic *χsina* with Old Hungarian *axsin* Abaev argues with reference to the momentary, unstable character of the Ossetian prothetic vowel *ä*. It must be noted, however, that from the view-point of Hungarian *axsin* > *asszony* the prothetic *a* in the Alanic prototype of this loan-word must have been a very stable vowel because otherwise it would not have prevailed against the force of vowel harmony. Thus my confrontation of Alanic *χsina* with Old Hungarian *axsin* becomes even more valid.

To p. 64. On the position of the Chorasmian cf. W. B. Henning: *Handbuch der Orientalistik. I. Abt. IV. Bd. 1. Abschn. Iranistik. I. Abschn. Linguistik*. Leiden—Köln 1958 109 foll. Henning judges about the common features of Chorasmian and Ossetian rather negatively.

To p. 64. As W. B. Henning, *The Khwarezmian Language*. Zeki Validi Togan'a Armağan. Istanbul 1955. 10 has shown, the Chorasmian plural suffix *-c* goes back in fact to *-k*.

To p. 65. On Chorasmian *'rθmwχ* cf. now V. A. Livshits: *Acta Ant. Hung.* 16 (1968) 442 who shows that this name does not occur on the coins. On *Uruzmag* cf. V. I. Abaev: *Нартовский эпос*. *Изв. СОНИИ* 10 (1945) 25 foll. (**Varāz-man*), *Осетинский язык и фольклор*. I. 92, E. Benveniste: *Études sur la langue ossète*. 129 (**Avarazmaka*-).

To p. 66. Cf. also F. Altheim: *Aus Spätantike und Christentum*. Tübingen 1951. 59 foll. and *Geschichte der Hunnen. I.* Berlin 1959. 57 foll.

To p. 67. During the last two decades H. W. Bailey gave important contributions to the historical analysis of the Ossetian vocabulary in almost everyone of his papers.

To p. 73. It is hardly correct to trace back the names *Kustašpi* and *Kundašpi* to Old Iranian **Vištāspa*- and **Vindāspa*- as Kretschmer and Nyberg did. I now presume the Old Iranian forms **Kuštāspa*- and **Kundāspa*- as Old Iranian prototypes.

To p. 74. On the Indo-Aryan linguistic elements in the Ancient Near East cf. now M. Mayrhofer: *Die Indo-Arier im Alten Vorderasien*. Wiesbaden 1966, with almost complete bibliography, A. Kammenhuber: *Die Arier im Vorderen Orient*. Heidelberg 1968., E. A. Grantovskiy: *Ранняя история иранских племен Передней Азии*. Moscow 1970.

To p. 75. On the Javian dialect cf. also G. Akhvlediani: Сборник избранных работ по осетинскому языку. I. 60 foll.

To p. 76. The problem of Ossetian *c* < *čy*- was again treated by E. Benveniste, *Études sur la langue ossète*. 22 foll. with similar results. He omits, however, to refer to my above analysis.

To p. 77. L. Zgusta, *Die Personennamen griechischer Städte der nördlichen Schwarzmeerküste*. 263 made the surprising statement that we do not know anything about the ethnical qualification of the *Arraei Sarmatae*. Does the qualification *Sarmatae* not say him really anything?

To p. 78. The problem of the name *Alani* was often discussed in the meantime. At first I would add A. Freiman: RO 3 (1925) 158 foll. (*alān* < *aryānām* — *ir* < *ēr* < *err* < *arya*-) to my references. Cf. further V. I. Abaev: Осетинский язык к фольклор. I. 156, 245 foll., F. Altheim: *Aus Spätantike und Christentum*. 63, 168 und *Geschichte der Hunnen*. I. 58 foll., L. Zgusta: *Die Personennamen griechischer Städte der nördlichen Schwarzmeerküste*. 264, I. Gershevitch: BSOAS 17 (1955) 486, V. I. Abaev: Историко-этимологический словарь осетинского языка. I. 47 foll., 545 foll., H. W. Bailey: TrPhS 1959. 98 foll., G. Akhvlediani: Сборник избранных работ по осетинскому языку. 211 foll. As to the recent attempts to elucidate the origin of the name *Alani*, I restrict myself to a few short remarks here.

1. A form **ārya*- cannot be evidenced in Iranian languages, accordingly we can only suppose an Old Iranian form **arya*- as starting point. Thus the form *allon* cannot be a genuine development from **aryāna*- in Ossetian.

2. *Alan* is a name which is never applied by the Ossetes to themselves. This fact speaks against the Ossetian origin of this term.

3. The development *-ry-* > *-l-* cannot be proved in Ossetian reassuringly, because all reliable instances quoted by Abaev and others only show *-ri-* > *-l-*.

4. The Eastern Ossetes use the name *ir*, *iron* to denote themselves, consequently this name must be genuine and cannot be regarded as of Caucasian origin. Because the Western Ossetes do not denote themselves with the term *irä*, this form may be borrowed by them from the Eastern Ossetes.

5. The name *asi* is used by the Ossetes as the denomination of Balkaria where the place-names prove the former existence of a population speaking an Ossetian dialect.

From all these facts it follows that the problem of the historical relations between *Alani*, *Ās* and *Ossetes* is a very complicated one. I hope to come back to this question.

To p. 79. As a parallel to *Ἀλέξαρχος* reflecting the earlier stage of phonemic development, the name *Ἀλλάξαρχος* (Eltegen, 2nd half of the 1st — 1st half of the 2nd centuries A. D., CIRB No. 931) can be quoted. The assumption of Zgusta (*Die Personennamen griechischer Städte der nördlichen Schwarzmeerküste*. 64) that *Ἀλέξαρχος* might be a clerical error for *Ἀλέξαρχος* is a mere invention.

To p. 80. The name *Μάλδαχος* is uncertain because it is only restored as [Μα]λδα- [χος?] by Latyschew (cf. CIRB No. 199).

To p. 81. Zgusta (*Die Personennamen griechischer Städte der nördlichen Schwarzmeerküste*. 232 foll.) would like to eliminate all instances of the phonemic change *-ry-* > *-l-* in Sarmatian. He says: "Es kann sich auch um verschiedene Aussprachen handeln, die in der Schrift den Ausdruck fanden." This is hardly possible. We can reckon with two possibilities: 1. The Sarmatian dialects had only the phoneme /r/. In this case no alternation between *r* and *l* was possible. 2. The phoneme /l/ arose

as a result of the phonemic change *-ry/ri-* > *-l-*. In this case an alternation between *r* and *l* can perhaps be assumed, but it proves already the phonemic change *-ry/ri-* > *-l-*. Another instance for *-ry-* > *-l-* can be recognized in the name *Θυλόγανος*, which can be traced back to an Old Iranian form **čiryakāna-*.

To p. 82. Zgusta (*Die Personennamen griechischer Städte der nördlichen Schwarzmeerküste*. 263 foll.) would like also to cancel the name *Ἀορσοί*, but his argumentation is only based on a series of misunderstandings. He calls in doubt the possibility of a transcription *ao* of the diphthong *au*. But this was the only possible correct way of transcription because *av* in Greek was already monophthongized. Then he quotes the form *Avorsorum* from Tacite but such a reading does not exist (cf. also F. Altheim: *Geschichte der Hunnen*. I. 70, 74 foll. on the different readings of the name in the codices of Tacite). Zgusta questions even the existence of the Ossetian word *urs* 'white' and he asserts that the Osseto-Russian dictionary by Kasaev does not contain it. On p. 344 foll. of Kasaev's dictionary, however, the word *urs* together with his numerous compounds can be found. Otherwise I already discussed all these problems in the 1st edition in a detailed manner.

To p. 87. The doubts expressed by W. P. Schmidt (BzN 7 [1956] 208) in connection with the interpretation of the name *Ἀσφώρονος* are unfounded. He is not even acquainted with Middle Persian *asvār* ('swb'l) 'horseman, knight'.

To p. 91. Abaev interprets the name *Παρσπάνακος* as **pars-panak* = Ossetian *fäjnäg-fars* 'whose side is (strong as) a board'. I see no reason to abandon my interpretation. The etymology of Ossetian *fäjnäg* is unclear (the proposal of Abaev cannot be accepted) and it is doubtful whether it can be presumed in Sarmatian. Beside the interpretation proposed by me previously, the explanation **pars-pānak* 'side-guard, body-guard' is also possible (cf. Middle Persian *puštīy-pān* 'body-guard', literally 'back-guard') and perhaps it is even better.

To p. 92. The interpretation of *Sangi-* in the name *Sangibanus* by the help of Avestan *saṇha-* can hardly be correct. Nor is the attempt of Abaev to identify *Sangi-* with Ossetian *cong* 'hand' far better.

To p. 92. On the name *Ἀρδάμων* cf. L. Zgusta: *Die Personennamen griechischer Städte der nördlichen Schwarzmeerküste*. 70. I do not regard the separation *Ἀρδάμ[. .]νος Πινμάζου* as convincing. Dividing, however, the text into *Ἀρδάμ[. .]ν Ὀσπινμάζου*, we can only restore the form *Ἀρδάμ[μω]ν*.

Zgusta, *op. cit.* 269 tries to eliminate the examples for *-an-* > *-on-*. In his opinion *Μαιτώνιον* is grecized on the pattern of *Πανιώνιον* etc. This assumption is, however, hardly correct. An Iranian form **mēton(i)* could, of course, be transcribed as *Μαιτώνιον* in Greek, but if the Iranian prototype would have been **mētan(i)*, surely this would have been grecized on the pattern of *Ἀσκανία*, *Βαγδανία* etc. or on that of *Μέθανα*, *Αἰλανα* etc. Accordingly, the evidence of the name *Μαιτώνιον* for *-an-* > *-on-* remains valid further on.

In the case of *Σιώμαχος* the argumentation of Zgusta is hardly comprehensible. He adopts my interpretation *Σιώμαχος* < **Syāmaka-*, but he refuses to use this name as an evidence for the phonemic development *-ām-* > *-om-* for that reason that *a* in the name *Ἀσφώρονος* also developed into *ō* among other circumstances. Where is a logic here?

To p. 92. The form *syōmaχ* cannot go back to Old Iranian **syāmaka-*, but only to **syāma-axva-* 'evil-minded' (lit. 'dark-minded').

To p. 93. After examining the passage in App. Mithr. 88, it seems to me quite certain that the *Ἀγροί* cannot be identified with the *Ἄγροί* 'a tribe of the Maiotai' in Strabo XI. 2, 11. Accordingly, the interpretation of this name from Old Iranian

**agra-* does not encounter any difficulty.

To p. 93. The correct interpretation of the name *Οὔρυβαζος* was already found by E. Benveniste: MSL 23 (1927) 133. Cf. also E. Benveniste: *Études sur la langue ossète*. 64, note 2.

To p. 93. On *višta-* cf. E. Benveniste: JA 227 (1936) 229, O. Szemerényi: BzN 2 (1951) 165 ff., H. W. Bailey: JRAS 1953. 101—103, W. Brandenstein—M. Mayrhofer: *Handbuch des Altpersischen*. Wiesbaden 1964. 154.

To p. 93. Even though the interpretation of the name *Χανάκης* from Old Iranian **hanaka-* is certainly possible, now it seems to me still doubtful. On the other hand I also regard the proposal of Abaev to trace back this name to Old Iranian **χvanaka-* unlikely, because Old Iranian **χva-* usually appears as *Χο-* or *Χω-* in the Iranian names occurring in the Greek inscriptions of the North Pontic region.

To p. 94 foll. Now I regard the following interpretations as correct: *Σαιταφάρνης* < **χšaita-farnah-* and *Σαῖοι* < **χšaya-*.

Addendum to p. 53. On the invasion of the Goths under Traianus Decius cf. B. Gerov: *Die gotische Invasion in Mösien und Thrakien unter Decius im Lichte der Hortfunde*. Acta Ant. Philippopolitana, Studia Hist. et Phil. Sofia 1963. 127—146.

Addendum to p. 56. On the date of the settlement of the Sadagarii in Roman territory cf. G. Fehér: UJb 15 (1935) 413 (466 A. D.) and F. Altheim: *Attila und die Hunnen*. Baden-Baden 1951. 211, note 50 (he rejects the theory of Fehér and supports a dating of the settlement after the battle at the river Nedao in 455 A. D.).

On the problem of the Sadagarii and Sadagis cf. T. Nagy: *Budapest műemlékei* (The Public Monuments of Budapest). Budapest 1962. II. 68 and note 113, L. Várady: *Das Letzte Jahrhundert Pannoniens 376—476*. Budapest 1969. 335 and note 833. T. Nagy hesitates to identify the Sadagis with the Sadagarii, but in any case he considers remarkable that both the Sadagarii and the Sadagis were living in the neighbourhood of the Skiri. Against this view it is to be noted that the Sadagis never made a common action together with the Skiri and the immediate neighbourhood of the two tribes is unprovable on the one hand, and we have no evidence for the earlier neighbourhood of the Sadagarii and the Skiri before their joint settlement in Roman territory on the other hand. L. Várady says: "Freilich handelt es sich dabei um Varianten desselben Namens." Here we have to do with an obvious vicious circle. Since K. Zeuss: *Die Deutschen und die Nachbarstämme*. München 1837. 709 historical research usually supposes that Sadagis and Sadagarii are one and the same people and on this basis one often regards *Sadagis* and *Sadagarii* as variants of the same name. But as a matter of fact neither can from historical view-point the identity of the two peoples be proved nor can from linguistic view-point the two names be regarded as variants. Thus the whole theory is only based on the similarity of the names *Sadagis* and *Sadagarii*. I would still add that I never said that according to the report of Iordanes the Sadagarii were transplanted in Roman territory before 455 as Várady asserts, but I supposed that some fractions of peoples, and among others the Sadagarii too, already immigrated into the Roman Empire earlier than it was reported by Iordanes.

APPENDIX II

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliographical Works

- J. Banner—I. Jakabffy: *Archäologische Bibliographie des Mittel—Donau—Beckens*. Budapest 1954. On Cimmerii and Scythians: 229—236. On Sarmatians: 338—388.
- J. Banner—I. Jakabffy: *Archäologische Bibliographie des Mittel—Donau—Beckens* 1954—1959. Budapest 1961. On Cimmerii and Scythians: 131—133. On Sarmatians 179—180.
- J. Banner—I. Jakabffy: *Achäologische Bibliographie des Mittel—Donau—Beckens* 1960—1966. Budapest 1968. On Cimmerii and Scythians: 80—100. On Sarmatians: 157—162.

Cimmerian and Scythian Epoch

- M. I. Artamonov: Сокровища скифских курганов. Prague 1966.
- Ch. M. Danov: Древна Тракия. Sofia 1969.
- Gy. Gazdapusztai: *Beziehungen zwischen den präskythischen Kulturen des Karpatenbeckens und des Nordkaukasus. (Beiträge zum sogenannten Kimmerierproblem.)* Acta Ant. Arch. 5 (1963) 1—40.
- Gy. Gazdapusztai: *Zusammenhänge der Kulturen der ungarischen Tiefebene und des Nordkaukasus in der Skythenzeit.* Acta Ant. Arch. 8 (1965) 107—118.
- Gy. Gazdapusztai: *Caucasian Relations of the Danubian Basin in the Early Iron Age.* Acta Arch. Hung. 19 (1967) 307—334.
- M. Gimbutas: *Bronze Age Cultures in Central and Eastern Europe*. Paris—The Hague—London 1965. 479—517 and 528—577.
- B. N. Grakov: Каменское городище на Днепре. MIA No. 36 Moscow 1954.
- J. Harmatta: *Cimmerii and Scythians.* (In Hungarian). Ant. Tan. 13 (1966) 107—116.
- J. Harmatta: *Früheisenzeitliche Beziehungen zwischen dem Karpatenbecken, Oberitalien und Griechenland.* Acta Arch. Hung. 20 (1968) 153—157.
- A. A. Iessen: К вопросу о памятниках VIII—VII вв. до н. э. на юге европейской части СССР. SA 18 (1953) 49—110.
- V. A. Il'inskaia: Скифы днепровского лесостепного Левобережья. Kiev 1968.
- G. Kossack: *Pferdegesschirr aus Gräbern der älteren Hallstattzeit Bayerns.* JRGZ 1954. 111—178.
- O. A. Krivtsova—Grakova: Степное Поволжье и Причерноморье в эпоху поздней бронзы. MIA No. 46. Moscow 1955.
- E. Kroupnov: *A propos de la chronologie de l'âge du fer au Caucase Nord.* VI. Congrès International des Sciences Préhistoriques et Protohistoriques. Les rapports et les informations des archéologues de l'URSS. Moscou 1962. 3—14.
- Y. I. Krupnov: Киммерийцы на Северном Кавказе. MIA No. 68. Moscow 1958. 176—195.
- Y. I. Krupnov: Древняя история Северного Кавказа. Moscow 1960.
- P. D. Liberov: Памятники скифского времени на Среднем Дону. Arch. SSSR Nr. D 1—31. Moscow 1965.
- A. I. Melyukova: Вооружение скифов. Arch. SSSR. Moscow 1964.
- A. Mozsolics: *Mors en bois de cerf sur le territoire du bassin des Carpathes.* Acta Arch. Hung. 3 (1953) 69—111.
- M. Párducz: *Le cimetière hallstattien de Szentes—Vekerzug.* I. Acta Arch. Hung. 2 (1952) 143—169, II. 4 (1954) 25—91, III. 6 (1955) 1—22.
- M. Párducz: *Graves from the Scythian Age at Ártánd.* Acta Arch. Hung. 17 (1965) 137—231.
- M. Párducz: *Western Relations of the Scythian Age Culture of the Great Hungarian Plain.* Acta Ant. Hung. 13 (1965) 273—301.

- M. Párducz: *The Scythian Age Cemetery at Tápiószele*. Acta Arch. Hung. 18 (1966) 35—91.
 V. G. Petrenko: Правобережье Среднего Приднепровья в V—III вв. до н. э. Arch. SSSR No. D 1—4. Moscow 1967.
 K. Schefold: *Die iranische Kunst der Pontusländer*. Handbuch der Archäologie. München 1954. 424—454.
 D. B. Shelov (Editor): Вопросы скифо-сарматской археологии. Moscow 1955.
 A. Vulpe: *Necropola hallstattiană Ferigile*. Bucuresti 1967.

Scythians, Sarmatians and Greeks in the North Pontic Region

- T. V. Blavatskaya: Западнопонтийские города в VII—I веках до н. э. Moscow 1952.
 V. D. Blavatskiy: Пантикапей. Очерки истории столицы Боспора. Moscow 1964.
 A. I. Boltunova (Editor): Античный город. Moscow 1963.
 Chr. M. Danoff: *Pontos Euxeinus*. RE IX. Suppl. 866—1920.
 V. F. Gaydukevich: Боспорское царство. Moscow—Leningrad 1949.
 V. F. Gaydukevich (Editor): Ольвия и Нижнее Побужье в античную эпоху. MIA No. 50. Moscow—Leningrad 1956.
 V. F. Gaydukevich (Editor): Античная история и культура Средиземноморья и Причерноморья. Leningrad 1968.
 J. Harmatta: К истории Херсонеса Таврического и Боспора. „Античное общество”. Moscow 1967. 204—208.
 D. P. Kallistov: Очерки по истории Северного Причерноморья. Leningrad 1949.
 M. M. Kobilina (Editor): Материалы и исследования по археологии Северного Причерноморья в античную эпоху. MIA No. 33. Moscow 1954.
 V. V. Lapin: Греческая колонизация Северного Причерноморья. Kiev 1966.
 D. B. Shelov (Editor): Древности Нижнего Дона. Moscow 1965.

Greek Inscriptions

- E. I. Solomonnik: Новые эпиграфические памятники Херсонеса. Kiev 1964.
Corpus Inscriptionum Regni Bosporani (CIRB). Moscow—Leningrad 1965.
 T. N. Knipovich—Y. I. Levi: Надписи Ольвии (1917—1965). Leningrad 1968.

Sarmatians and Alani

- F. Altheim—R. Stiehl: *Geschichte Mittelasiens im Altertum*. Berlin 1970.
 M. I. Artamonov: Вопросы расселения восточных славян и советская наука. Проблемы всеобщей истории. Leningrad 1967. 29—69.
 Y. S. Gagloev: Аланы и скифо-сарматские племена Северного Причерноморья. Изв. ЮОНИИ АН СССР 11 (1962) 107—171.
 Y. S. Gagloyti: Аланы и вопросы этногенеза осетин. Tbilisi 1966.
 J. Harmatta: Из истории алано-парфянских отношений. Acta Ant. Hung. 13 (1965) 127—147.
 M. G. Moshkova: Памятники прохоровской культуры. Moscow 1963.
 E. A. Rikman: Поздние сарматы Днестровско-Дунайского междуречья. SE 1966/1. 68—88.
 B. A. Ribakov (Editor): Черняховская культура. MIA No. 82. Moscow 1960.
 K. F. Smirnov: Сарматские племена Северного Прикаспия. KSIMK 34 (1950) 97—114.
 K. F. Smirnov: Вопросы изучения сарматских племен и их культуры в советской археологии. Вопросы скифо-сарматской археологии. 195—219.
 K. F. Smirnov—V. G. Petrenko: Савроматы Поволжья и Южного Приуралья. Moscow 1963.
 K. F. Smirnov: Савроматы. Ранняя история и культура сарматов. Moscow 1964.
 G. Vernadsky: *Der sarmatische Hintergrund der germanischen Völkerwanderung*. Saeculum 2 (1951) 340—392.
 G. Vernadsky: *The Origins of Russia*. Oxford 1959.
 M. I. Vyaz'mitina: Золота балка. Поселення сарматського часу на нижньому Дніпрі. Kiev 1962.

History of the Dobrudja

- R. Vulpe: *Histoire ancienne de la Dobroudja*. Bucarest 1938.
 D. M. Pippidi—D. Berciu: *Din istoria Dobrogei. I*. București 1965.
 R. Vulpe—I. Barnea: *Din istoria Dobrogei. II*. București 1968.
 E. Condurachi: *Problèmes économiques et sociaux d'Histria à la lumière des dernières recherches. Nouvelles études d'histoires*. Bucarest 1955. 71—84.
 D. M. Pippidi: *Epigraphische Beiträge zur Geschichte Histrias in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*. Berlin 1962.
 E. Condurachi (Editor) *Histria. Monografie arheologică. I*. București 1954. *II*. București 1966.

The Sarmatians in Hungary

- L. Barkóczy: *Transplantations of Sarmatians and Roxolans in the Danube Basin*. Acta Ant. Hung. 7 (1959) 443—453.
 N. Fettich: *Archäologische Beiträge zur Geschichte der sarmatisch-dakischen Beziehungen*. Acta Arch. Hung. 3 (1953) 127—178.
 D. Gabler: *Terrae Sigillatae in the Barbarian Territory Neighbouring Eastern Pannonia*. (In Hungarian). AÉ 95 (1968) 211—241.
 J. Harmatta: *M. Párducz, Denkmäler der Sarmatenzeit Ungarns. I—III*. Acta Arch. Hung. 2 (1952) 341—352.
 J. Harmatta: *The Dissolution of the Hun Empire. I*. Acta Arch. Hung. 2 (1952) 277—305, cf. especially 277—281.
 J. Harmatta: *Iranier, Germanen und Römer im Mittleren Donabecken*. (Paper read at the Congress for Classical Studies, Eforia 1960.)
 A. Mócsy: К вопросу о периодизации раннесарматской эпохи. Acta Arch. Hung. 4 (1954) 115—128.
 A. Mócsy: *Pannonia*. RE IX. Suppl. 515—776.
 T. Nagy: *The Archaeological Monuments of Buda*. (In Hungarian). Budapest műemlékei (The Public Monuments of Budapest). Budapest 1962. 13—116.
 M. Párducz: *Denkmäler der Sarmatenzeit Ungarns. III*. Budapest 1950.
 M. Párducz: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sarmaten in Ungarn im II. und III. Jahrhundert*. Acta Arch. Hung. 7 (1957) 139—182.
 Á. Salamon: *Sarmatische Funde in Ócsa*. FA 11 (1959) 75—89.

The Language of the Sarmatians and Alani

- V. I. Abaev: *Осетинский язык и фольклор. I*. Moscow—Leningrad 1949.
 V. I. Abaev: *Историко-этимологический словарь осетинского языка. I*. Moscow—Leningrad 1958.
 G. Akhvlediani: *Сборник избранных работ по осетинскому языку*. Tbilisi 1960.
 E. Benveniste: *Études sur la langue ossète*. Paris 1959.
 M. I. Isaev: *Дигорский диалект осетинского языка*. Moscow 1966.
 L. Zgusta: *The Iranian Names from the North Coast of the Black Sea*. Acta Orient. Hung. 4 (1955) 245—249.
 L. Zgusta: *Die Personennamen griechischer Städte der nördlichen Schwarzmeerküste*. Praha 1955.
 Cf. W. P. Schmid: BzN 7 (1956) 207—210.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Acta Ant. Arch.	Acta Antiqua et Archaeologica (Szeged)
Acta Ant. Hung.	Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae
Acta Arch. Hung.	Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae
Acta Orient. Hung.	Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae
AE	Archaeológiai Értesítő
AfsI Ph	Archiv für slavische Philologie
AGGW	Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen
AH	Archaeologica Hungarica
AMI	Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran
Ant Hung	Antiquitas Hungarica
Ant. Tan.	Antik Tanulmányok
Anz. f. A.	Anzeiger für die Altertumswissenschaft
Arch. SSSR	Археология СССР. Свод археологических источников
BSOAS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
BzN	Beiträge zur Namenforschung
CAH	Cambridge Ancient History
CIRB	Corpus Inscriptionum Regni Bosporani
EPhK	Egyetemes Philológiai Közlöny
ESA	Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua
FA	Folia Archaeologica
Grd. d. i. Ph.	Grundriss der iranischen Philologie
IIAK	Известия Императорской Археологической Комиссии
IOSPE	Inscriptiones Orae Septentrionalis Ponti Euxini
IPEK	Jahrbuch für prähistorische und ethnographische Kunst
Izv. AN SSSR OLY	Известия Академии Наук СССР Отделение Литературы и Языка
JA	Journal Asiatique
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JHS	Journal of Hellenic Studies
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
JRGZ	Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentral-Museums
KCSA	Kőrösi Csoma Archivum
KSIMK	Краткие Сообщения Института Истории Материальной Культуры
KSz	Keleti Szemle
KZ	Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft
MAR	Материалы по археологии России
MIA	Материалы и исследования по археологии СССР
MNy	Magyar Nyelv
MO	Le Monde Oriental
MSL	Mémoires de la Société Linguistique
NK	Numizmatikai Közlemények
NS	Нумизматика и сфрагистика
RE	Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft
RHC	Revue d'Histoire Comparée
RLV	Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte
RO	Rocznik Orientalistyczny

SA	Советская археология
SE	Советская этнография
SBAW	Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften
SWAW	Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften
TrPhS	Transactions of the Philological Society
UJb	Ungarische Jahrbücher
VDI	Вестник древней истории
WaG	Die Welt als Geschichte
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft
ZII	Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik
ВДИ	Вестник древней истории
ИАН СССР ОЛЯ	Известия Академии Наук СССР Отделение Литературы и Языка
Изв. СОНИИ	Известия Северо-Осетинского Научно-Исследовательского Института
Изв.ЮОНИИ АН ГССР	Известия Южно-Осетинского Научно-Исследовательского Института Академии Наук Грузинской ССР
СВ	Советское Востоковедение

INDEX

A. Geographical Names

Abbreviations: c.=country, d.=department, district, mt.=mountain, r.=river, s.=site, t.=town, tr.=tribe, v.=village

- Abdera, t. 28
- Abzoe*, tr. 83
- Aedi*, tr. 29
- Afghans 67
- Akhtanizovskaya Stanitsa, s. 34
- Alani* 78
- Alans, Alani 32, 42, 48, 49, 52, 62—68, 79, 82, 83, 96, 97, 101, 103, 105
- A-lan* 78, 82
- al-Lān* 78
- Alan, fortress 65
- Alan-kala, fortress 65
- al(-l)ārisiya* 66, 67
- Alexandropol, s. 35
- Amisos, t. 21
- Amu-Darya, r. 64
- cf. Oxus
- Anti*, tr. 66
- Aorsi, Aorsians, tr. 32—34, 38, 66, 82, 83
- Aparnoi, tr. 13
- Apollonia, t. 26, 27
- Aquincum, t. 100
- Aral, Lake 13, 33, 104
- Aral region 34
- Ardaragantes*, tr. 53, 101
- Areatae*, tr. 29, 77, 78
- Arii*, tr. 77, 78
- Arimaspi*, *Arimaspoe*, tr. 83
- Armenians 38
- Arraei Sarmatae*, tr. 29, 77, 78, 105
- Arsi*, tr. 66, 67
- Arsoae*, tr. 83, 84
- *Arzoe*, tr. 83
- Asagartiya, tr. 70
- Ās*, tr. 64, 66, 67, 105
- As-Digūr, tr. 67
- Asia 11
- Asia Minor 26
- Asiani*, tr. 63, 66, 67
- Atamanovi Kostī, s. 46
- Athens, t. 43
- Azov, Sea of Azov 13, 59
- Bactri*, tr. 84
- Bactria, c. 33, 34, 67
- Băile-Herculane, v. 54
- Balkans, c. 26, 28, 40, 99
- Balkans, Northern, c. 26
- Balkar territory 91
- Balkars, tr. 62, 75
- Banat, c. 41, 53
- Barbarians 17
- Barbarians of the Pontus 23
- Basternae, tr. 22, 24, 27—30, 49, 51, 56, 98
- Bead River 46
- Bistra Valley 54
- Black Sea 15, 46—48, 50—53
- cf. Pontus
- Black Sea region 47
- cf. Pontic region
- Bononia, t. 56
- Bori, t. (D. of Kutais) 39
- Borysthenes-Dnieper 20, 21, 31
- cf. Dnieper

- Bosporan Kingdom 18
Boudioi, tr. 71
 Britannia, c. 31
 Budini, tr. 9
 Bulaq, tr. 11
 Bulgaria, c. 35, 37, 38
 Byzantines 13
- Caransebeş, v. 54
 Carpathian Basin 37, 45
 Carpathian Ruthenia 4
 Carpi, tr. 49, 51, 53, 56
 Caspian Sea 13, 34, 38
 Caucasus, mt. 8, 36, 38, 58, 104
 Caucasus, Northern, mt. 62
 Celtic peoples 8
 Celtic tribe 11, 98
 Celts, tr. 36, 45
 Central Asia 59, 102
 Chernyakhovo, s. 46, 102
 Chersonese, t. 16—20
 Chersonesians 14, 16—18
 Chinese 33
Choamani, tr. 84
 Chorasmians, tr. 64—67
 Cimmerii, tr. 7, 8, 98
Clariae, tr. 29
 Colchians, tr. 15
 Crimea, c. 16, 19, 48
 Crimean Greek cities 22, 23
 Crimean Peninsula 22, 23
 Crimean Scythian Kingdom 18, 20
 Crimean Scythian power 22
 Crimean Scythian state 14, 18
 Crimean Scythians 18—20, 22, 30, 32
 Csongrád, t. 47
- Daai Xandioi, tr. 14
 Dacia, c. 45, 47, 51, 53—55
 Dacian Empire 41
 Dacians, tr. 30, 41—45, 99
 Daco-Mysian tribes 8
 Dahae, Daai, tr. 13
 Dahian tribe 13
 Dalmatae, tr. 100
 Danube, r. 12, 14, 16, 21, 23—29, 32, 34, 37, 39, 41, 48, 51, 54, 56, 57, 99, 100, 102
 cf. Istros, r.
 Danube—Tisa region 42
- Dardani, tr. 28
 Davidov, d. 47
 Delphi, t. 26
 Dentheletians, tr. 28
 Dierna, v. 54
 Dioscurias, t. 39
 Dnieper, r. 12, 16, 19—21, 31, 32, 39, 49
 cf. Borysthene
 Dnieper, Lower, r. 99
 Dnieper Basin 47
 Dnieper region 22, 34
 Dniester, r. 99, 102
 Dobrudja, c. 16, 22, 24—27, 30, 98, 99
 Dobrudjan Scythians 22, 29
 Don, r. 12, 14, 21, 23, 25, 28, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 48, 49
 cf. Tanais, r.
 Donets, r. 49
 Donets region 16
 Dunaszekcső, v. 56
- Eger, t. 41
Enoecadioe, tr. 84
 Ernőháza, v. 46
 Europe, Central 7
 Europe, Eastern 7, 82, 98, 100, 102
 Euxine coast 39
 cf. Pontic region
 Euxine, Northern 36
 cf. Pontic region
- Fedulovo, s. 35
- Galatae, tr. 11, 98
 Galiche, s. 34, 37, 38
 Galicia, c. 41
Gambrivii, tr. 83
 Germans, Eastern 50—52
 Getae, tr. 21, 22, 24, 25, 29
 Godeanul, mt. 54
 Gorgippia, t. 90, 93
 Goths 47, 49—53, 56, 57, 102, 107
 Great Hungarian Plain 44, 54, 55, 57, 100, 102
 Greece, c. 26
 Greek cities (colonies) in the Pontus (Black Sea), Pontic Greek cities 23, 24, 37, 39, 43, 44, 46—48
 North Pontic Greek cities 97, 99, 100, 103

- Greeks 16, 17
 reeks, Pontic, of the Pontus 23, 43
Gutones, tr. 83
- Haemus, mt. 29
Halani, tr. 78
 cf. *Alani*, Alans
amaxobii, *Hamaxobioe*, tr. 83
 áromszék (Trei Scaune), d. 37
- Histria, t. 99
 cf. Istros, t.
 Hsiung-nu, tr. 32, 34
 Hungarians 50, 61, 62, 102
 Hungary 41, 42, 44, 45, 47, 49—56, 98, 101
 Huns 7, 11, 46, 49, 57
 cf. Hsiung-nu
 Hurrians 74
 Hylaia, c. 20
- Iaxartes-Syr-Darya, r. 34, 46
 cf. Syr-Darya
 Iazyges, tr. 12, 25, 31, 32, 36, 41—45, 48—53, 55—57, 86, 100
 Illyricum, c. 56
 India 38
 India, North 46
 Indo-Scythia, c. 39
 Indo-Scythians, tr. 10, 34, 36—38, 40
 Iran, c. 74
 Iran, Eastern, c. 65, 68
 Iran, North-Eastern, c. 64
 Iranians 59, 98
 Iranians, Pontic 59
 Iron Gates 41, 54
 Ishtafan, t. 71
 Isker, r. 27
 Istetskaya Yurta, s. 34
 Istrians 16
 Istros, r. 24
 cf. Danube
 Istros, t. 22, 26, 27, 30
 cf. Histria
 Italy, c. 56
 Iyrcae, tr. 9
- Jallatis, t. 26, 27
 Karachay territory 91
 Karachay, tr. 62
 Kashmir, c. 33
- Kazakstan, c. 8
 Kertsh, t. 46, 47
 cf. Panticapaeum
 Khazars, tr. 64
 Kiszombor-Ernőháza, s. 100
 Koshibeyev, s. 46
 Kutlovica, v. 53
 Kuzminsk, s. 46
- Limigantes*, tr. 53, 101
- Macedonia, c. 26
 Maeotis, Sea 13, 24
 cf. Azov, Sea of A.
 Magyars 25 cf. Hungarians
 Mangishlak Peninsula 65
 Marcomanni, tr. 56
 Medes, tr. 38, 39, 59, 70, 71, 73, 74
 Median tribes 96
 Mehadia, v. 54
 Mingrels, tr. 62
 Mishkina Pristan, s. 46
 Moesi, tr. 29
 Moesia, c. 52—55
 Moesia, Lower, c. 53, 55
 Moesians 55
 Monor, v. 47, 100
 Morava, r. 27
 Muntenia, c. 100
 Mursa, t. 55
- Naqš-i Rustam, s. 23
 Near East 74
 Nedao, r. 107
Neuri, *Neuroe*, tr. 83, 84
 Noin-Ula, s. 37
 Novouzensk, s. 34
- Odessa, t. 47
 Oescus, r. 27
 cf. Isker
 Olates, tr. 20
 Olbia, t. 10, 17, 19—24, 30, 32, 43, 44, 46—48, 75, 86—90, 92—94, 99, 100
 Olbians 24
 Olt, r. 53
 Oltenia, c. 41, 42, 51, 53—55
 Orekhovo, d. 38
 Orgovány, v. 47
 Ossetes, tr. 59—68, 79, 96, 97, 105
 Ossetes, Caucasian, tr. 64

- Oxus, r. 59
cf. Amu-Darya
- Pangaei*, tr. 78
Pannonia, c. 55, 56, 100
Pannonia, Upper, c. 55
Panticapaeum, t. 12, 19, 75, 80, 87, 90, 92—94, 100
cf. Kertsh
Paralatai, tr. 14
Parioi, tr. 13, 14
Parni, tr. 13
Parthia, c. 39
Parthian Empire 38
Parthians 23
Pechenegs, tr. 64, 66
Permia, c. 46
Persia, c. 38
cf. Iran
Persian tribes 96
Persians 13, 59, 70, 71, 73, 74
Phanagoria, t. 79, 80, 88, 89
Plugova, v. 54
Pontic Empire 21, 38
Pontic region 12, 14, 15, 17—24, 38—40, 47, 48, 52, 53, 58
cf. Black Sea region
Pontic region, North 76, 103, 107
Pontic region, Northwestern 101
Pontic Sarmatian Empire 18
Pontus 15, 16, 18, 32, 39, 59
cf. Black Sea
Poroina, s. 29, 99
Porta Orientalis, pass 54
Prokhorovka, s. 38
- Qizil Alan, v. 65
Quadi, tr. 56
- Ratiaria, t. 27
Retezat, mt. 54
Roman Empire 56, 107
Romans 24—26, 30, 44, 56, 83, 99
Rome 28, 42, 54
Roumania, Little 29
Roumanian Lowlands 41
Roumanian Plain 24, 30, 49—51, 55
Roxolani, tr. 12, 14, 15, 18, 31, 32, 36, 41, 42, 44, 45, 47—57, 101
Russia, South(ern) 7, 8, 10, 11, 19, 20, 33—38, 42, 43, 46, 48, 49, 58, 63, 67—69, 86, 96
Russians 7
- Sacae, tr. 33, 66
Sacae, Eastern, tr. 33, 34
Sadagares, tr. 101
Sadagarii, tr. 57, 101, 107
Sadagis, tr. 101, 107
Saii, tr. 11, 12, 19, 32, 34, 98
Saka, tr. 32, 33
Salir, tr. 65
Sanigae, tr. 86
Sarmatae, *Arraei*, tr. 29
Sarmatia, Asiatic, c. 33
Sarmatian state 43
Sarmatians, *Sarmatae*, tr. 8—10, 16—19, 21—26, 29—32, 34, 36, 38—43—45, 50—53, 55—57, 59, 63, 96—98, 100, 103, 104
Sarmatians, Late, tr. 101, 102
Sarmatians, Pontic, tr. 32, 33
Sarmatians, Royal, tr. 12, 30—32, 37, 40, 41, 95
Sarmatians, Western, tr. 33, 34, 36, 37, 38
Sarmisegethusa, t. 54
Saudaratae, tr. 11, 12
Sauromatae, Sauromatians, tr. 8—10, 27, 98
Scaugdae, tr. 29
Scordiscians, Little, tr. 27
Scythia, c. 9, 43
Scythia, Little, c. 16, 57
cf. Dobrudja
Scythian Kingdom 52
Scythian state 43
Scythians, tr. 7, 8, 12, 13, 15—19, 21—27—31, 33, 39, 42, 44, 52, 59, 68, 98, 102—104
cf. Crimean Scythians
cf. Dobrudjan Scythians
Scythians, Royal, tr. 13, 95
Scythians, Western, tr. 98
Sea of Aral 65
cf. Aral, Lake
Sea of the Khazars 64
cf. Caspian Sea
Severskaya Stanitsa, s. 34, 35
Siberia 37
Siracians, tr. 32—34, 36

- Sirmium, t. 55
 Skiri, tr. 11, 49, 107
 Slavs, Eastern 7
 Slavs, Southern 7
 Sofia, t. 28
 Sogdians, tr. 67
 Somogy, County 56, 101
 Starobel'sk, s. 34, 37
 Stepan Razin kolkhoz, s. 47
 Steppeš, Aralo-Caspian 13
 Steppes, Caspian-Pontic 82
 Steppes, of Western Turkestan 33
 Steppes, South Russian 42, 59
 Steppes, West-Asiatic 12
Sugambri, tr. 83
 Syr-Darya, r. 13
 cf. Iaxartes
 Szil, v. 56, 101
 Szörce (Surcea), s. 37

 Taganrog, t. 34, 37
 Taifals, tr. 50
 Tanais, t. 75, 80, 85—90, 92, 94
 Tanais-Don, r. 18, 19
 cf. Don
 Taxila, t. 38, 39
 Theodosia, t. 18
 Thisamatae, tr. 11, 12
 Thrace, c. 29
 Thracia, c. 56
 Thule, c. 31, 56
 Thyssagetæ, tr. 9
 Timişul, r. 54
 Tisa, r. 8, 41, 100
 Tobol, r. 35
Togar, tr. 66
Tokhar, tr. 66
 Tokharians, tr. 32, 66
 Tomi, t. 22, 25—27, 41, 100
 Trandî, s. 46
 Transaquincum, fortress 56
 Transcaucasia, c. 39
 Transylvania, c. 8, 53, 54

 Transylvanian Basin 54
 Tribal confederacy, Western Sarmatian
 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 29, 30, 37, 40, 43
 Tribal federations, nomadic Iranian 95
 Triballian territory 38
 Triballians, tr. 16, 27—29, 39
 Tribes, Iranian 73, 86
 Tribes, Iranian tr. of South Russia 60,
 74, 96
 Tribes, Median 70, 73
 Tribes, Northern Balkan 26
 Tribes, Persian 70, 73
 Tribes, Sarmatian 32, 34, 35, 37—39, 69
 Tribes, Turkmen 65
 Tribes, Western Sarmatian 34
 Turkestan, Western, c. 33
 Tyras, t. 15, 47, 88

 Urgi, tr. 12, 32, 41
 Uspenskaya Stanitsa, s. 34
 Ust-Urt plateau 65
 Uzboy, r. 64
 cf. Amu-Darya

 Vandals, tr. 50, 101
 Varangians, tr. 7
 Vidin, t. 27
 Volga, r. 46
 Volga Basin 48
 Voronezh, Gov. 47

 Wisigothæ, tr. 83
 Wu-sun, tr. 63, 66, 67

 Xandioi, tr. 13, 14
 Xanthioi, tr. 13
 Xwārizm, c. 63, 65

 Yanchokrak, s. 34, 37
 Yaxartes, r. 59
 cf. Iaxartes, Syr-Darya
 Yen-ts'ai, c. 33, 34, 66, 82
 Yüeh-chih, c. 31—34, 38, 39, 66, 99

 Zelenchuk, v. 62

B. Personal Names

- Akrosas, Scythian king 22
 Alaksandar (the Great) 23
 cf. Alexander the Great

 Alexander the Great 13, 23, 31
 Amage, Sarmatian queen 16—19, 32
 C. Antonius, consul in 63 B. C. 22, 30

- Ardawān V, Parthian king 81
 Aristagoras 20, 21
 Arsaces I, Parthian king 13
 Atheas, Scythian king 16, 98
 Boirebistas, Dacian king 21, 22, 28, 30, 41
 Carus, Roman Emperor 56
 Charaspes, Scythian king 22
 Cicero, M. Tullius C. 30
 Ap. Claudius Pulcher, consul in 79 B. C. 26
 Constantine the Great 49, 50, 57
 L. Cornelius Scipio, consul in 83 B. C. 26
 L. Cornelius Sulla, dictator 26, 30
 Cyrus the Great, Persian king 23
 Dareios the Great, Persian king 23
 Decebal, Dacian king 42
 Diocletianus, Roman Emperor 56
 Diophantos, general of Mithridates VI 14, 18, 21
 Epikrates, architect 20, 21
 Gallienus, Roman Emperor 54, 55
 Gatalos, Sarmation king 9, 19, 43
 Ingenuus, Roman Emperor 55
 Julianus, Roman Emperor 57
 Kanites, Scythian king 22
 Marcus Aurelius, Roman Emperor 45, 47, 48, 51, 101
 Maximianus, Roman Emperor 56
 Maximinus I, Roman Emperor 48
 Mithridates VI Eupator king of Pontus 14—16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26—30, 35, 37—40, 99, 101
 Neoptolemos, general of Mithridates VI 21
 Nikeratos, military commander 18, 20, 21
 Ovid 41
 Pairisades VI, Bosporan king 35
 Palakos, Scythian king 14, 15, 18, 30
 Pharnakes I, king of Pontus 19
 Philip, king of Macedonia 16, 17, 28
 Philippus, Roman Emperor 53
 Phraates II, Parthian king 33
 Protogenes, citizen of Olbia 10—12
 Regalianus, Roman Emperor 55, 101
 Saitapharnes, king of the Saii 11, 18
 Salmanassar, Assyrian king 73
 C. Scribonius Curio 26
 Skiluros, Scythian king 18—21, 30, 32
 Tanusas, Scythian king 22
 Tasios, leader of the Roxolani 14
 M. Terentius Varro Lucullus 26
 Tiberius, Roman Emperor 100
 Traianus Decius, Roman Emperor 53, 54, 107
 Valentinian I, Roman Emperor 50
 Vonones, Parthian king 23
 Zopyrion, Macedonian general 17

C. Authors Quoted

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Alexander Polyhistor 86 | Dio Chrysostomus |
| Anonymi Peripl. Ponti Eux. 77 94 | Log. Borysth. p. 49, Dindorf 24 |
| Ammianus Marcellinus 51, 53 | Diodorus Siculus |
| XVII 2, 2 50 | XX 22, 4 78 |
| XVII 12, 18 57 | Ephoros 9 |
| XXII 8, 31 52 | Epitome de Caesaribus |
| Appianus | 32, 3 55 |
| Mithr. 15 24 | Eusebios 100 |
| 19 24 | Vita Const. 4, 6 57 |
| 69 24, 30 | Faustus Byz. |
| 88 93 | 4, 2 82 |
| Arrianos | Firdusi 65 |
| Peripl. 11, 3 86 | Flavius Iosephus |
| Artemidoros 9, 14 | VII 7, 4 78 |
| Bīrūnī 64 | Florus 26 |
| Dio Cassius | Han-shu |
| 71, 16, 1 86 | 96. c. s. v. Chi-pin 33 |

an-shu		Poseidonios	14
96/I	33	FGrHist 87 F 32	15
ecataeus	52	FGrHist 87 F 104	27
erodianos	48	Procopius	86
erodotos	11, 52, 73	De bello Vand. I 3, 8	85
	102	Ptolemaios, Ptolemy	53, 66, 83
I 134	13	III 5, 15	92
IV 6	14	V 8, 13	33
IV 20, 22, 56, 59	13	VI 14, 10	34
IV 21, 110—117	9	Pseudo-Julian	101
Ipparchos	31	Pytheas	31
Historia Augusta	48	Shih-chi	123
trig. tyr. 9	55	Stephanos Byz.	86
Car. Num. et Carin. 9	56	Strabo	25, 26, 28, 29, 83
lou-Han-shu		I 2, 1	15
118 c.	78	II 5, 7	31
lypsikrates	14	VII	14
on Rusta	25	VII 3, 2	27
ordanes	57, 107	VII 3, 17	12, 22, 24
Get. 37	92	VII 3, 18	41
Iustinus (Trogus Pompeius)		VII 4, 3	18, 21, 30
IX 2, 15	16	VII 4, 6	44
XXXVIII 3, 6	24	VII 4, 16	21
leo the Wise		VII 5, 18	9
XVIII 42	13	VII 23, 17	18
Lucanus	100	IX 9, 3	13
Mas'ūdī	66	XI 2, 6	39
Mela, Pomponius		XI 2, 11	93
I 116	9	XI 2, 14	15
II 1	83	XI 5, 8	38
Ovid	41, 100	XI 9, 3	93
Tristia III 10, 34; 12, 30	25	Tabula Peutingeriana	84
Epist. ex Ponto IV 7, 9—10 25		IX 5, X 1	83
Pausanias	44	Tacitus	
Philo of Byblus	86	Germ. 46	28
Pliny the Elder	66	Ann. II 2	23
n. h. IV 41, 44	29	Ann. XII 15, 16, 19	83
IV 80, 88	83, 84	Hist. I 79	50
IV 83	84	Trogus Pompeius	16
VI 19	10	cf. Iustinus	
VI 38	83	Tzetzes	62
VI 47, 48	84	Wei-lüe	
Polyainos		frg. 22	78
VIII 56	16—18		
Polybios	12		
XXV 2	9		

D. Greek Index

- Ἀβδάρδα* 58, 94
 cf. *Ἀρδάβδα*
Ἀγαροι 93, 106
Ἄγιον 86
Ἄγροι 93, 106
Ἀζαρίων 94
Ἀΐλανα 106
Ἀλανοί 78, 79, 92, 96, 103
Ἀλέξανδρος 79, 80
Ἀλέξαρχος 79, 80, 81, 94, 96, 105
Ἀλέξαρχος 105
ἀλέξω 80
Ἀλλάξαρχος 105
Ἀμαξόβιοι 83
Ἀμβουστός 81
Ἀμόργης 84
Ἀμώσπαδος 85
Ἀμύργιοι 84
Ἀνδάνακος 92
Ἄντες 66
Ἀορνός 84
Ἀορσοί 82—85, 106
Ἀρδάβδα 58, 94
 cf. *Ἀβδάρδα*
Ἀρθάμων, Ἀρθάμμων 92, 106
Ἀριαράθης 79
Ἀριαράμνης 79
Ἀριμασποί 83
Ἀριφάρνης 78, 96
Ἀρσῆτις 66, 67
Ἀσίοι 63, 66, 67
Ἀσκανία 106
Ἀσπάδανα 71
Ἀσπακος 85
Ἀσπαρ 85, 88
Ἀσπουργός 87, 93
Ἀσφώρουγος 87, 88, 106
Ἀτοσσα 84
Αὐτοφραδάτης 84
Ἀφθαίμακος 94
Ἀφθείμακος 94
Ἀψαχός 87
Ἀψώγας 87
Βαγδανία 106
Βαϊόρασπος 86
Βανάδασπος 86, 96
Βάνας 92
Βιδάκης 93
Βίστης 93
Βόρασπος 86
Βωρόψαζος 86, 87
Γάος 85
Γώσακος 59, 85
Δάαι *Ξάνδιοι* 13, 14, 95
 cf. *Ξάνδιοι*
Διδυμόξαρχος 94
Δοσυμόξαρχος 94
δυσμένης 90
ἐν 91
Ζάρανδος 92
Ἥλμανος 81
Ἡρακῆς 58, 80, 81, 85
Θυλόγανος 106
Ἰνσάξατος 58, 93
Ἰράμβουστός 81
Ἰραύαδης 81
Ἰρβίς 80, 81
Ἰργανός 81
Ἰώδας 85
Καϊνάξαρχος 59, 80, 94
Κάσαχος 59
Κηνέξαρχος 80, 94
Λείμανος 58, 90
Λίμνακος 90
Μαιτώνιον 92, 106
Μάλδαχος 80, 105
Μέθανα 106
Νάμγινος 59, 92
Νεοπτολέμων πύργος 21
Νευροί 83
Ξάνδιοι 13, 14, 95
 cf. *Δάαι*
Ξάνθιοι 13, 85, 106
Ξάρθανος 94
Ξάρταμος 94
Ξόβας 94
**ἽΟαρζοί* 84
Ὀσπίνμαζος 106
 cf. *Πίνμαζος*
Οὔργβαζος 93, 107
Οὔργιος 93
Πανιώνιον 106
Παραλάται 14
Πάριοι 14, 93, 95
Παρσπάνακος 91, 106
Πάτεις 88

Πίδανος 88, 92
Πίδεις 88
Πίνμαζος 106
 cf. *Ὅσπινμαζος*
Πίσσουροι 13
Πιτοφαρνάκης 88
Πουρθαῖος 88, 96
Πουρθάκης 88
Ῥωξάνη 85
Σαῖος 19
Σαῖοι 94, 95, 107
Σαιταφάρνης 11, 94, 95, 98, 107
Σακανοί 33
Σάναγος 92
Σανάνων 97
Σεαύαχος 78, 85
Σιάουος 75
Σιαύαχος 75, 78
Σιαύακος 75
Σιώμαχος 92, 106
Σόρχακος 59
Σπαδάγας 86

Σπάδακος 86
Σφαρόβαις 87
Φαλδάρανος 58, 90, 91
Φηδάνακος 88
Φιδάνους 88, 92
Φίδας 58, 88
Φλείμναγος 89, 90
Φλίανος 89, 90
Φλιμάνακος 90
Φόδακος 88, 89
Φοργάβακος 88
Φορήρανος 81, 88, 92
Φορίανος 85, 88
Φόρος 89
Φούρτας 58, 89, 96
Φόσακος 89
Χανάκης 93, 107
χας 63
**Χόαρζοι* 84
χσινα 63
**Ψενδαρτάκη* 86
Ψευδαρτάκη 86

E. Subject Index

Abbreviation l. language(s)

Afghan l. 76
 Alanic l. 48, 60—66, 68, 102, 103
 archaeological remains
 of Cimmerii 8
 of Iazyges 42, 52
 armour of chipped scales of bone 44,
 50, 52
 arms 43
 art
 Eastern 35
 Graeco-Indian 10, 34, 35, 37, 38
 Irano-Celtic 35
 Aryan l. 69, 72—74
 Avesta 81, 82
 Avestan l. 69, 70, 72
 Baluchi l. 76
 barrow graves 50, 52, 57
 cf. *tumuli*
 battle of Olbia 17
 beads
 chalcedonic 47
 cubo-octaëdric 45—48
 of semi-precious stones 46

bow 44
 cf. *reflex-bow*
 buckle(s)
 chalcedonic 47
 pelta-shaped 46, 100, 101
 „Sarmatian” 45—47
 with cross-shaped pin 46
 with long metal strip 46
 with short metal strip 46
 without metal strip 46
 caravan route, Central Asiatic 38
 centres, Pontic 45, 47
 Chorasmian l. 60, 64—66, 68, 104
 Cimmerian l. 8
 coins
 Indo-Scythian 39
 Parthian 39
 Roman 56
 culture, Late Scythian 99
 dagger (from Prokhorovka) 38
 dialect(s)
 Digorian (Western Ossetian) 62, 63
 Javian (Southern Ossetian) 75, 76, 105

- Middle Persian 71
- Modern Persian 71, 76, 77
- Northwestern Iranian 71
- Ossetian 63, 76, 104
- Sarmatian 76, 96, 97, 102, 103, 105
- Siwandī 71
- dialectology
 - of Iranian languages 96, 102
- Eastern Iranian 1. 67, 68
- Eastern Ossetian 1. 61, 76, 79
- endogamy, tribal 65
- epenthesis
 - i-* 81
 - u-* 81, 82, 85
- Epoch
 - Cimmerian 98
 - Hellenistic 94
 - Scythian 98
- family of languages, Indo-European 59, 60
- family-tree theory 60, 61, 63, 67, 69, 70, 102, 103
- fibula(e) 45
- fibula with downward bent leg 45, 47
- find(s)
 - Sarmatian 34—39, 42, 45, 47
 - Scythian 42
 - Akhtanizovskaya Stanitsa 34
 - Alexandropol 35
 - Atamanovi Kosti 46
 - Bori 39
 - Chernyakhovo 46, 102
 - Ernőháza 46
 - Fedulovo 35
 - Galiche 34, 37, 38
 - Istetskaya Yurta 34
 - Kertsh 46, 47
 - Koshibeyev 46
 - Kuzminsk 46
 - Mishkina Pristan 46
 - Novouzensk 34
 - Orgovány 47
 - Poroina 29, 99
 - Prokhorovka 38
 - Severskaya Stanitsa 34, 35
 - Starobelsk 34, 37
 - Stepan Razin kolkhoz 47
 - Szil 56, 101
 - Taganrog 34, 37
 - Taxila 38, 39
 - Tobol 35
 - Trandī 46
 - Uspenskaya Stanitsa 34
 - Yanchokrak 34, 37
- find group(s)
 - Sarmatian 100
 - of Kiszombor-Ernőháza 100, 101
- graves
 - flat 50, 52, 57
 - lazygian 42
 - Scythian kurgan 42
 - cf. barrow graves
- group of languages
 - Northern Iranian 60
 - Scythian 60
- gynaecocracy 9
- horse, multicoloured 11
- horse trappings 8, 34
- import
 - Pontic 46, 100, 101
 - Roman 100, 101
 - cf. merchandise, trade
- Indo-European 1. 72
- inscription(s)
 - Apollonios 99
 - Aristagoras 20, 22, 99
 - Attic merchant 19
 - Epikrates 20, 22, 30, 99
 - Greek, of South Russia 76
 - Nikeratos 18, 20—22, 30
 - Old Persian 23, 70—72
 - Panticapaeum 12
 - Pontic Greek 96, 102, 107
 - Protopogenes 10, 11, 16, 17, 19, 32, 33, 43, 95, 98
 - Zelenchuk 62
- Iranian 1. 96
- kings, Crimean Scythian 17
- Dobrudjan Scythian 22
- language(s)
 - Afghan 76
 - Alanic 48, 60—66, 68, 102, 103
 - Aryan 69, 72—74
 - Avestan 69, 70, 72
 - Baluchi 76
 - Chorasmian 60, 64—66, 68, 104
 - Cimmerian 8
 - Eastern Iranian 67, 68
 - Finno-Ugrian 96

- language(s)
 Indo-European 72
 Iranian 96
 Median 71, 73
 Middle Iranian 70, 72, 73, 103
 Modern Iranian 69, 70, 72, 73
 Modern Persian 69
 Old Indian 74, 103
 North Iranian 68
 Northwestern Prakrit 67
 Old Iranian 58, 70, 72—74, 92, 103
 Old Ossetian 59, 60, 76, 97
 Old Persian 69, 70, 72
 Ossetian 50, 58, 59, 61, 64—69, 74—76, 79, 97, 102, 103
 Ossetian, Eastern 61, 76, 79
 Ossetian, Southern 61, 76
 Ossetian, Western 61, 76
 Parthian 103
 Pecheneg-Turkish 64
 Persian 103
 Proto-Iranian 69, 72—75, 81, 103, 104
 Saka 65, 67
 Sarmatian 60, 61, 63, 68, 69, 96, 97, 102, 103
 Scythian 8, 59—61, 63, 68, 69, 102
 Sogdian 60, 64, 66, 67, 77
 Yagnobi 60, 61
- limes
 Olt 53
 Roman 51, 57
- linguistic area 60
 linguistic community 60, 61
 linguistic stage, Proto-Iranian 71, 74
 linguistic state, Proto-Iranian 70
 loan-words 96
 loan-words
 Ossetian (Alanic), in Hungarian 61, 62, 68
- matriarchy 9
 Median 1. 71, 73
 merchandise, Babylonian 38
 cf. import, trade
- metal (objects), precious 43, 45
- migration
 Saka 33
 Tokharian-Saka 32
 Yüeh-chih 32
 of lazyges 41, 100
 of Medes and Persians 74
- migration
 of Roxolani 50, 101
 of Sarmatian tribes 100, 101
 Migration of Peoples 7, 16
 Modern Iranian 1. 69, 70, 72, 73
 Modern Persian 1. 69
- names
 Alanic 48, 102
 Aryan 74
 East Germanic 50, 51
 Iranian 96, 102
 Sarmatian 50—52, 75—77, 102
 Scythian 102
 cf. place-names
- neolinguist theory 69
 North Iranian 1. 68
 Northwestern Prakrit 67
 Old Indian 1. 74, 103
 Old Iranian 1. 58, 70, 72—74, 92, 103
 Old Ossetian 1. 59, 60, 76, 97
 Old Persian 1. 69, 70, 72
 Ossetian 1. 50, 58, 59, 61, 64—69, 74—76, 79, 97, 102, 103
- ox-carts, Sarmatian 2
 pact of 179 B. C. 19
 parent language 70—72
 Parthian 1. 103
 Pecheneg-Turkish 1. 64
 pendant, double 45, 46
 Persian 1. 103
- phalerae 34—39, 99, 100
 gilded silver 10
- phonemic change
 -abā- > -avā- > -ā- 88
 -ān-/-ām- > -on/-om 91, 92
 -ān- > -ōn 97, 106
 ary- > il- 81
 ary- > ir- 81
 au > ō 85
 ċ > c 64, 75
 č- > š- 76
 čy- > c- 105
 fri- > fli- 89, 90
 -gr- > -rg- 87, 93
 h- > Ø 64
 ha- > a- 93
 -iya- > -iy(u)- 89
 k'i- > š'i- > š- 75
 p- > f- 88
 -ri- > -l- 90, 105, 106

phonemic change

-ry- > -l- 78—80, 105, 106

-sp- > -fs- 86

-sp- > -sf- 87, 88

sy- > f- 72, 73

sy- > hy- > xv- 72, 73

sy- > š- 75

š- > č- > š- 76

š- > s- 64

š-i- > š- > s- 75

-ti > -ci 64

-θr- > -rt- 64

vi- > gu-/ku- 73

vi- > i- 93

xš- > š- 94

place-names, Ossetian 91

plural ending

Chorasmian -c 64, 104

Ossetian -t, -tä 29

Sarmatian -t 78

„Scythian” -t 60

Sogdian -t 29

Yagnobi -t 29

pottery 43, 45, 47

reflex-bow 8

cf. bow

royal tribe(s) 12, 39

Sarmatian 12, 30—32, 34, 37, 40, 41, 95

Scythian 13, 95

Saka 1. 65, 67

Sarmatian 1. 60, 61, 63, 68, 69, 96, 97, 102, 103

scribes, Persian and Parthian 81

Scythian 1. 8, 59—61, 63, 68, 69, 102

Sogdian 1. 60, 64, 66, 67, 77

Southern Ossetian (Javian) 1. 61, 76

suffix

Afghan -ai 76

Baluchi -ag 76

lasygian -uh 88

Middle Iranian -(a)gān 81

New Persian -a 76

Old Iranian -ainaka- 80

-aixaka- 80

-(a)-kāna- 81

-(a)-na-ka- 80

-anayaka- 80

-at- 80

-(a)t-a-ka- 80

suffix

-it- 80

-ita- 80

-ka- 80

-naka- 80, 88

-t- 80

-t-a- 80

-taka- 80

Ossetian -ag, -agä 59, 76, 88

-äg 59, 76

-gin 59

-ug/-ig 88

Saka -laka- 80

-lika- 80

-naa- 80, 88

-tca/-ca 86

Sarmatian -ακος, -αγος 59, 91

-γηνος 59

-ζος 86

-ovγος 86

Sogdian

-’k 77

-(’)n’k 80, 88

-’nyk 80

-’yk 80

-’yn’k 80

sword(s)

long 50, 51

short, with ringed

and cylindric hilts 45, 47, 48, 50, 56, 101

Tetrarchy 49, 56

tombs, Alanian 48

trade

Pontic 42, 44, 45, 47

Sarmatian 39

Transcaucasian 39

with Northern India 46

cf. import, merchandise

trade route 38

cf. caravan route

tumuli 57

cf. barrow graves

Turfan texts 71

Wars

Mithridatic 26—29, 38, 39

Sarmatian 56

wheat 43

workshops, Pontic 45, 99

Yagnobi 1. 60, 61

F. Word Index

Aryan

**svarnas*- 72

Proto-Iranian

**puθra*- 103

Old Iranian Reconstructed

**agra*- 93, 107
 **ama*- 94
 **anya*- 82
 **arta-mana*- 92
 **aruša*- 85
 **arya*- 29, 77, 78, 80, 81, 105
 **arya-farnah*- 78
 **arya-ka*- 80
 **aryaman*- 81
 **arya-xšaθra*- 79
 **aryāna*- 105
 **aryānām* 10, 78
 **arž-awa*- 83
 **aspa*- 85—87
 **aspa-axva*- 87
 **aspabāra*- 85, 88
 **aspačānah*- 85
 **aspaka*- 87
 **aspa-ugra*- 87, 93
 **auruša*- 85
 **Avarazmaka*- 104
 **āryakāna*- 81
 **āryana*- 82, 92
 **ārya-vaidah*- 80
 **ārsya*- 67
 **āryāna*- 78, 79, 81
 **āryānām vaijah*- 79
 **āryānām xšaθram* 78
 **āvarana*- 84
 **baivaraspa*- 86
 **baya*- 87
 **bānu*- 89, 92
 **čiryakāna*- 106
 **dušmanah*- 90
 **Fradāta*- 71
 **fri*- 89

**friyamanah*- 58, 90
 **friyāna*- 90
 **friyamāna*- 89
 **hanaka*- 107
 **haptāti*- 64
 **haumavarga*- 84
 **hu-arž*- 83—85
 **hutausā*- 84
 **hu-varna*-/hu-warna- 84
 **kainaxšaθra*- 80
 **kundāspa*- 104
 **kuštāspa*- 104
 **marya*- 80
 **marya-taka*- 80
 **narya*- 82
 **para-tara*- 91
 **pari-darana*- 91
 **pari-spanaka*- 91
 **pari-tara* 91
 **pari-tarana*- 91
 **paru*- 89
 **paruaspa*- 85
 **paru-āryana*- 81
 **parugav*- 88
 **parupasu*- 89
 **paru-yava*- 88
 **parvya*- 14, 91, 93, 95
 **pati*- 88
 **pita*- 88
 **pita-na*- 88
 **puθra*- 89
 **puθraka*- 88
 **riyanti* 89
 **safa-taka*- 80
 **sata-gari*- 101
 **spara*- 87

*spāda- 86
 *syāma-axva- 106
 *syāmaka- 92, 106
 *syāvamaka- 92
 *syāvanāna- 97
 *-tara- 91
 *igra- 87
 *ugra- 87, 93
 *ugra-bāzu- 93
 *vanataspa- 86
 *Varāz-man- 104
 *vātafradāta- 84
 *Vindāspa-73, 104
 *vista- 93

*višta- 93, 107
 *Vištāspa- 73, 93, 104
 *war- 84
 *xvanaka- 107
 *xvarnah- 72
 *xšaita- 94
 *xšaita-farnah- 98, 107
 *xšaθra- 94
 *xšaθra-ama- 94
 *xšaθra-na- 94
 *xšaub- 94
 *xšauba- 94
 *xšaya- 98, 107
 *xšayant- 95
 *zaritaka- 82

Old Iranian in Assyrian Texts

Auarparna 73
 Ēparna 73
 Kundašpi 73, 104

Kuštašpi 73, 104
 -parna 73
 Šīirparna 73

Old Persian

^mIp-ra-(a-) du-par-na-’ 73
^mDa-da-par-na-’ 73
 *Dādafarnah- 73
 farnah- 11, 71, 72, 94
 *Frādafarnah- 73
 *gaušaka- 85
 haumavarga- 84

paruviya- 14
 vayaspāra- 87
 višta- 107
 Vištāspa- 93
 *wāta- 84
 *wātafradāta- 84

Avestan

ayra- 93
 apāxtara- 91
 apānk- 91
 aiwi 91
 aiwītara- 91
 an- 91
 antara- 91
 ama- 85
 aurusa- 82
 arājah- 83
 arāta- 92
 arəθamant- 92
 airya- 58, 77, 81

airyana- 79
 airyanəṃ xvarəṇō 79
 airyanəṃ vaējō 79
 airyaman- 81
 aspāyaōda- 85
 ugra- 87
 gaodāyah- 85
 gaoša- 85
 gavayan- 85
 xšaob- 94
 xšaθra- 59, 94
 xšaya- 11, 94, 95
 xšayant- 13

darəna- 90
duš.manah- 90
paradāta- 14
paōirya-, paouruya- 14
pairi 58, 90, 91
pāθra- 90
pitā, pitar- 58, 88
puθra- 58, 59, 88
puḍa- 89
pouruspāḍa- 86
bay- 87
bā- 87
bānu- 92
bāzu- 93
brvat- 80
fra- 91
fratarā- 91
frya- 89, 90
fryāna- 89, 90
naire.manah- 90
niš 91
ništara- 91
maēḍana- 92
mana- 92
manah- 90
mas- 80
masit- 80
masita- 80
yava- 85
vaētay- 80
vaēḍay- 80
vaēḍah- 80
vistō. fraorətay- 93
(višta-) 93

vī 91
vītara- 91
vid- 93
vidaṭ. gav- 93
visaiti 58, 82, 93
raoxšnā- 85
rap- 87
saēnō 75
satō. kara- 101
safa- 80
saṇha- 92, 106
sāmahe 75
sāy- 11, 94
sāyuzdri- 11, 94
suxra- 59
spā- 87
spāḍa- 85
spənta- 86
syāmaka- 92
syāva- 78, 85
srutō. spāḍa- 86
šāēta- 11, 94
šavaitē 75
šāiti- 75
šā 75
hapta- 58, 94
hana- 93
hamō. manah- 90
hazaṇra- 94
hutaosā- 84
hu. manah- 90
hu-zāmay- 80
huzāmit- 80
xvarənah- 11, 72, 94

Middle Iranian

**āurn* 84
**əmurǵ, əmurǵi* 84
**ətoš* 84
**əurn* 84
**drafš* 82
**err* 105
**ēr* 105
**Ērān* 78
**Ērān šahr* 78
**Frahāta* 71
**Guduvhara* 73

**Gundofarr* 73
**hūmūrga* 84
**hvarž* 85
**ir* 105
**Īrān* 78
**varz* 85
**xarz* 85
**xaz* 85
**xvarž* 85
**Yaxšārt* 46

Sarmatian

- **afsāy* 87
- **afsax* 87
- **alaxsar* 79
- **aläxsar* 80
- **area-* 78
- **arī* 86
- **arya-ta* 78
- **asp-urg* 87
- **aur* 84, 85
- **borāfsa-* 86
- **faldaran* 91
- **fida-* 88
- **fsänd* 86
- **fuda-* 89
- **fur* 89
- **furiran* 81
- **gōš* 85
- **iryān* 81
- **ir* 81
- **irak* 81
- **kēnäxsar* 80
- **limⁿnak* 90
- **malday* 80
- **mēton (i)* 106
- **parspanak* 91
- **pars-pānak* 106
- **pars-pānak* 106
- **sāvanōn* 97
- **syāv* 75
- **syāvag* 75
- **syāvak* 75, 78
- **syōmax* 92, 106
- **šaitafarn*/**šētafarn* 11, 94

Alanic

- A-da-chi* 62
- Addac* 62
- alan* 78, 79, 82, 103, 105
- as-* 63
- Ma-ta-rh-sha* 62
- Matārsa* 62
- os-* 63
- Paria* 91
- Sangibanus* 92, 106
- xas, xas, xaz* 63
- xsina* 63, 104

Middle Persian

- '*rdw'ng'n* 81
- '*swb'l* 106
- ardavānayān* 81
- arj* 83
- asvār* 106
- Bōiakān* 81
- Diž-i Alānān* 65
- ērmān* 81
- puštīy-pān* 106
- sagān, sakān* 33
- Sagānsāh* 33
- warž* 82
- **waržānak* 82
- **waržēnak* 82

Parthian

- **gōšak* 85
- Phraates* 71
- Phraates* 71

Sogdian

<i>'ry'nwyjn</i> 79	<i>š'w-</i> 75
<i>np'yš</i> 77	<i>šm'r-</i> 77
<i>np'yš'k</i> 77	<i>šm'r'k</i> 77
<i>pwt'n'k</i> 88	<i>šw-</i> 75
<i>s'n</i> 92	<i>aryān vēžan</i> 79
<i>spnčyr-spñ</i> 91	<i>yōδrazmag</i> 85

Chorasmian

<i>'rθmwx</i> 65, 104	<i>iβdac</i> 64
<i>wrθwmx</i> 65	<i>niyōsic</i> 64
<i>akic</i> 64	<i>nikanc</i> 64
<i>arθamux</i> 65	<i>sparc</i> 64
<i>arcivak</i> 64	<i>warθumax</i> 65

Saka

<i>āyinaa-</i> 88	<i>sāna-</i> 92
<i>pätajsa-</i> 87	<i>Skunxa-</i> 65
<i>rrätajsa-</i> 87	<i>ysīdaa-</i> 82

Ossetian

<i>afcäk</i> WO 76	<i>faldär</i> 90
<i>andon</i> 92	<i>fäjnäg</i> 106
<i>art</i> 92	<i>fäjnäg-fars</i> 106
<i>asi, assi</i> 67, 105	<i>fäl</i> 58, 90
<i>avd</i> 58	<i>fedavinag</i> 88
<i>äfcäg</i> EO 76	<i>fidä</i> 58, 88
<i>äfsä</i> 87	<i>fidon</i> 92
<i>āncad</i> 75	<i>fud</i> 88
<i>ärtä</i> 64	<i>*fudag</i> 88
<i>ävdai</i> 64	<i>fuduug</i> 88
<i>ävdäimag</i> 94	<i>fur</i> 89
<i>äxsart</i> 59	<i>furt</i> 58, 59, 89
<i>äxsinä</i> WO 63	<i>γosun</i> 59
<i>əfsäg, əfsäk</i> SO 76	<i>iγosag</i> 59
<i>'xsin</i> EO 63	<i>innä</i> 82
<i>bon</i> 89, 92	<i>*insadzag</i> (Old Oss.) 58
<i>bor</i> 86	<i>insäi</i> WO 58
<i>cäuən</i> 75	<i>ir</i> EO 29, 33, 58, 78, 80, 105
<i>čirγ</i> 87	<i>irä</i> WO 105
<i>cong</i> 106	<i>iron</i> 29, 33, 58, 79, 92, 105
<i>dälimon, däluiimon</i> 92	<i>ir</i> EO 79
<i>digor</i> 66	<i>īirä</i> WO 79

kānənc 64
kāsag 59
kāsun 59
limān, ləmān 59, 89, 90
liyun 89
liyuncä 89
**mon* 92
nomgin 59, 92
Oräzmäg 65
ors, ūrs 82, 85, 106
sau 75, 92
sau-äfcäg 76
säftäg 80

sk'uänxun 65
ssäj EO 58
son 92
surx 59
**šau* (Old Oss.) 75
**šaufčik* (Old Oss.) 76
Uruzmäg 65, 104
vidag 80
**Warzəmag* (Old Oss.) 65
**Warzumag* (Old Oss.) 65
Wäräzmäg 65
Wərazmäg 65
zäron 92

New Persian

arj 83
bör 86
dušmañ 90
irmān 81

siyāh 75
šād 75
warj 82

Eastern Iranian

nir (Shughni) 82
šāi (Wakhi) 11, 95

šil (Afghan) 82
šāyēn pl. (Shughni) 11, 95

Old Indian

aryaman- 81
āvaraṇa- 84
ārya- 67
cyavati 75
dharāṇa- 90
priya- 89
prīyate 90
prīyamāṇa- 89
bhrū- 80
marya- 80

rīyate 80
šyāma- 75, 92
šyāmaka- 92
šyāva- 75
šyena- 75
sphāna- 91
svarṇara- 72
haray- 80
harit- 80
harita- 80

Tokharian

ārši 60

Lycian

Humrkkā 84

Armenian

alanadrawšk' 82
alanazgik' 82
arcowēnšank' 82
azg 82
Boyekan 81

drawš 82
gušak 85
**waržnak* 82
waržnakanišk' 82

Caucasian

alanı (Mingrel) 62
alanı-koḡı (Mingrel) 78

šavi (Georgian) 75
Urzames (Abadzech) 65

Turkish

Alan (Turkmen) 65
ala yontlu 94
bulaq 11, 94

**sadaqar* 101
šau (Balkar) 75

Hungarian

achscin (Old. Hung.) 63
asszony 63, 104

axsin (Old. Hung.) 63, 104

Felelős kiadó: A József Attila Tudományegyetem Bölcsészettudományi Karának dékánja
Technikai szerkesztő: Szádeczky-Kardoss Samu.
70-2858 — Szegedi Nyomda